

Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 Item # VII

| Project No. | Request to Adopt the Bellevue Community Plan: 2002 Update |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Staff Reviewer | Wood |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Adopt the Bellevue Community Plan: 2002 Update |
| SUBAREA PLAN | This plan replaces the Subarea 6 Plan: 1996 Update |
| Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan | A Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan is included for the Highway 100/Old Harding Pike Triangle |
| Public Participation | Staff met with over 300 residents, property owners, and business owners in this community during a series of workshops and meetings held during March –October 2002. Staff presented the final plan at the last meeting on October 22, 2002. |
| Highlights | Many of the current land use policies remain unchanged. Most of the changes have involved Natural Conservation policy areas. The language for Natural Conservation policy has been changed so that it no longer provides for development at 2-4 dwelling units/acre under certain conditions. Instead, such areas have been identified and specifically mapped as Residential Low-Medium Density policy areas. Also, Natural Conservation areas that are zoned too intensively to implement the policy have been assigned to more appropriate policy categories that fit their zoning and development patterns. Three Neighborhood Centers have been designated: the Bellevue Town center at Old Harding Pike and Bellevue Road, the Highway 100/Old Harding Pike Triangle, and the Loveless Café/Motel area at the intersection of Highway 100 and McCrory Lane. |



Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 Item #VIII

| Project No. Staff Reviewer | Request to Amend the Plan for Subarea 8: The North Nashville Community Wood |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Approve amendment to The Plan for Subarea 8: The North Nashville Community |
| DETAILED NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN PLAN | Adopt the Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan for the Clifton/Southwest, College Heights/Clifton, and Tomorrow's Hope neighborhoods |
| SUBAREA PLAN | This amendment replaces current policy for a specified area within North Nashville with more detailed language tailored for the unique circumstances in these neighborhoods. |
| Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan | |
| Public Participation | Staff met with over 15 residents, property owners, and business owners in these three neighborhoods during a series of workshops and meetings held during September and October 2002. Staff presented the final plan at the last meeting on October 17, 2002. |
| Description | The Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan outlines the uniqueness of each planning neighborhood. |
| Clifton/Southwest | The Structure Plan identifies Clifton/Southwest as a mixed-use urban residential neighborhood. The Detailed Land Use Plan places most of the neighborhood under mixed-use policy. A Neighborhood Center is located at the intersection of 40 th Avenue North and Clifton Avenue. |
| College Heights/Clifton | The Structure Plan identifies College Heights/Clifton as a fairly low-density urban residential neighborhood. Most of the neighborhood falls under single-family detached residential policy, with a Neighborhood Center at Clifton Avenue and 39 th Avenue North |
| | |



| Tomorrow's Hope | The Structure Plan identifies Tomorrow's Hope as an urban residential neighborhood. The neighborhood is fairly evenly divided among single-family detached, single-family attached and detached, and mixed housing areas. Park and school sites are recommended at the northern edge of the neighborhood. |
|-----------------|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |



| Project No. | Zone Change 2002Z-020T |
|-----------------------|--|
| Council Bill | BL2002-1112 |
| Associated Cases | None. |
| Staff Reviewer | Kleinfelter |
| Staff Recommendation | Disapprove |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | This council bill proposes to amend Sections 17.04.060 (Definitions of General Terms), 17.08.030 and 17.16.110 of the Zoning Regulations to define and designate zoning districts for "Recycling Facilities." |
| ANALYSIS | |
| Existing Law: | Any facility that separates construction waste in order to recycle appropriate materials currently is allowed under the Zoning Code only as "Waste Transfer" (17.16.210(C)), which requires a minimum lot size of 10 acres, pre-approval of the site by the Metro Council, and approval of a special exception permit by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The Code provides for a "Recycling collection center," but such facilities are limited to "the temporary assemblage of small recyclable consumer items such as food and beverage containers, fabrics and paper." |
| Proposed Text Change: | The proposed text change would insert a new definition for "Recycling Facilities" as follows: "a facility or temporary location where any method, technique, or process is utilized to separate, process, modify, convert, treat or otherwise prepare construction waste or other dry materials for return to the economic mainstream as raw material for new, reused or reconstituted products. The use or reuse of such materials may not constitute solid waste disposal." |
| | "Recycling facilities" would be added to the Zoning District Land Use Table of 17.08.030 as "Permitted with Conditions" in the IWD, IR and IG zone districts. |



The following conditions would be required to be met before a permit could be issued for a Recycling Facility:

1. Minimum lot size of four acres, unless the facility is fully enclosed within a building, then the minimum lot size of two acres would be permitted.

2. All buildings, structures, storage containers and areas, and vehicle loading/unloading areas must be located a minimum of one hundred feet from any residential or mixed use zoning district boundary or residential structure.

3. <u>Landscape buffer yard</u>. The entire facility would be enclosed by an opaque fence at least eight feet tall. The fence would be required to be patrolled each day to remove all windblown debris captured by the fence. In addition, along all residential zone districts permitting residential use, screening in the form of landscape buffer yard Standard D would be required to be located <u>outside</u> the required fence.

4. Driveway access would be required to be from a collector or larger street. The collector street cannot be bounded by any residential zoning district from the driveway access point to the street's intersection with an arterial street.

The Vice Mayor has appointed a special committee to investigate several solid waste management issues, including recent requests for location of waste transfer stations under the provisions of 17.16.210(C). The proposed text change would create "Recycling Facilities" as a new category of waste management use that would not meet the requirements for a waste transfer station under 17.16.210(C). Staff recommends that the proposed text change be considered along with all other waste management issues by the newly created Council solid waste study committee. Accordingly, staff recommends disapproval of the proposed text change at this time.

Recommendation:



| Project No. Associated Case Council Bill Staff Reviewer | Text Change 2002Z-021T None BL2002-1273 and BL2002-1171 (as amended) These council bills were referred to the Planning Commission after being amended and after a new bill was drafted to consolidate the language in the amended bill. The amended bill and the new bill contain the same language with a new 2,000-foot buffer. The Planning Commission approved BL2002-1171 with a 1,000-foot buffer on September 12, 2002. Leeman |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with a 2,000 foot buffer, which would be the Commission's recommendation to the Metro Council for both BL2002-1273 and BL2002-1171. |
| REQUEST | Change the text of the Zoning Code to establish buffering distances between waste facilities and parks and schools, and by defining the term "park." |
| AMENDMENT PURPOSE | The purpose of this text amendment is to substitute a 2,000-foot buffer for the existing 2-mile buffer. After gathering more information regarding the minimum acceptable buffer distance between landfills/waste transfer stations, the Metropolitan Health Department, Pollution Control Division (PCD), has concluded that an increase from a 1,000 foot buffer to a 2,000 foot buffer from the landfill facility or a waste transfer station to the nearest school or park would be sufficient to prevent fugitive dust and odors from becoming a nuisance or a public health threat. |
| | The proposed amendments will effectively require landfills and waste transfer stations to be located at least 2,000 feet from the property line of any school or park. The PCD has conducted a literature review of similar setback requirements, finding the proposed setback of 2,000 feet to be consistent with requirements of other localities provided that the setback is from the property line of the park or school to the active area of the landfill. |
| | The predominate air pollutants emitted from the operation of a typical landfill or waste transfer station would be particulate matter in the form of fugitive dust and nuisance odors. The PCD is of the opinion that a 2,000 |



foot setback from the active area of a landfill or a waste transfer station to the nearest school or park would be sufficient to prevent fugitive dust and odors from becoming a nuisance or a public health threat. This opinion is based on the assumption that the facilities would be operated in full compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations including Section 10.56.170 "Emission of Gases, Vapors or Objectionable Odors" and Section 10.56.190 "Controlling Wind-borne Materials" of Chapter 10.56 "Air Pollution Control" of the Metropolitan Code of Laws.

The specific changes to the Zoning Code are listed below:

Section 1. That Title 17 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Zoning Regulations is hereby amended as follows:

By amending Section 17.16.110 A.2. Setback by deleting the words "two miles" and replacing them with the words "two thousand feet".

Section 2. That Title 17 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County, Zoning Regulations is hereby amended as follows:

By amending Section 17.16.110 B.3. Setback by deleting the period at the end of the sentence and adding the following provision:

", and further the facility shall not be located less than two thousand feet of the property line of any school or park."

Section 3. That Title 17 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County is hereby amended as follows:

By amending Section 17.16.210 A.1. Setback. By deleting the words "two miles" and replacing them with the words "two thousand feet".

Section 4. That Title 17 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County is hereby amended as follows:

By amending Section 17.16.210 B.2. Setback. By deleting the period at the end of the sentence and adding the following provision:

", and further the facility shall not be located less than two thousand feet of the property line of any school or park."

Section 5. That Title 17 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County be and the same is hereby amended as follows:

By amending Section 17.16.210 C.3. Setback. By deleting the period a the end of the sentence and adding the following provision:

", and further the facility shall not be located within two thousand feet of the property line of any school or park."



Section 6. That Title 17 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County be and the same is hereby amended as follows:

By amending Section 17.04.060 B. General Terms. By adding the following definition: "Park" means any facility that is:

1) open to the public for recreational uses, including, but not limited to, hiking, swimming, boating, camping;

2) predominately kept in a natural state; or

3) property of the local, state or federal government, or any department or agency thereof, specifically designated as a park, natural area or recreation area. However, the term "park" shall not include "greenways" as defined in Metropolitan Code of Laws section 17.04.060(B).

Section 7. That Title 17 of the Code of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County be and the same is hereby amended as follows:

By amending Section 17.16.040 A.2. Setback by deleting the period at the end of the sentence and adding the following language:

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Metropolitan Code of Laws, no new Community Education facility, as defined in Metropolitan Code of Law section 17.04.060 B., shall henceforth be constructed within 2,000 feet of the property line of any Landfill or other Waste Disposal or Transfer Facility.

Section 8. That Title 17 of the Code of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County be and the same is hereby amended as follows:

By adding the following language as a new section:

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Metropolitan Code of Laws, no new Park, as herein defined, shall henceforth be constructed within 2000 feet of the property line of any Landfill or other Waste Disposal or Transfer Facility.

Section 9. This ordinance shall take effect immediately after its passage and such change be published in a newspaper of general circulation, the welfare of the Metropolitan Government requiring it. However, in the event that an appellate court of the State of Tennessee renders a final judgment in the case of Consolidated Waste Systems, LLC v. Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson Co., TN, M2002-02582-COA-R3-CV, declaring the ordinance in effect prior to the enactment of this ordinance constitutional, this ordinance shall be automatically repealed, and its effect terminated.



| Project No. Associated Case Council Bill Deferral Staff Reviewer Staff Recommendation | Zone Change 2002Z-109U-07 None None This case was deferred by the Planning Commission on 11/14/02 until the 12/12/02 Planning Commission meeting. Hardison <i>Disapprove as Contrary to the General Plan. CS</i> |
|--|--|
| | zoning does not implement the intent of the Subarea 7 Plan's Residential Medium (RM) policy. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 0.30 acres from Residential (R8) to Commercial Services (CS) at 6120 Robertson Avenue. |
| Existing Zoning R8 zoning Proposed Zoning CS zoning | R8 zoning is intended for single-family homes and duplexes at 4.63 units per acre.CS zoning is intended retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, office, self-storage, light manufacturing and small warehouse uses. |
| SUBAREA 7 PLAN POLICY Residential Medium (RM) Policy Conflict | RM policy is intended for 4 to 9 dwelling units per acre. Yes. These properties are located in the Subarea 7 Plan's Residential Medium (RM) Policy area. This rezoning is inconsistent with the intent of RM policy. The Subarea 7 Plan states the following with respect to this area: "There has been a history of damaging zoning decisions from residential to industrial in this area. For the most part, these rezoned areas remain either undeveloped or residential. However, there has been recent residential investment in the area. It is the intent of the plan that this area be fully reclaimed for residential use, with the exception of locations that meet the criteria for unmapped nonresidential policies such as RN, RLC, and OT. To implement the RM policy, rezoning the underutilized industrially zoned area for residential use is necessary and is recommended." |



CS zoning will not work towards establishing residential uses or neighborhood scale retail uses compatible with a residential area.

| RECENT REZONINGS | None |
|-----------------------------|--|
| CODES VIOLATIONS | The applicant is requesting this zone change to accommodate an existing auto repair garage. The Metro Codes Department Property Standards division on August 12, 2002 cited this use. The citation stated the following: <i>"It has been reported the owner/tenet is operating an auto repair shop from the new garage that was built in 1999. Further – He has signage and ads located at various CS properties in the area."</i> Incident number 2002016775 The garage referenced in the citation was built in 1999 for the following purpose: <i>"To construct a new-detached 24' x 40' garage with a height not to exceed 16'. Not to be used for living nor commercial purposes."</i> Permit number 99-01578A This property was also cited in 1996 for storage of car/truck tires, parts, trash, and debris. At the November 14, 2002 Planning Commission meeting, this proposal was deferred to inform the applicant of the possible results rezoning this property would bring. During the Planning Commission hearing, staff informed the applicant that by state law the residence on the property would not be allowed to remain. Since the November 14 meeting, staff has learned that the residence would be allowed to remain. Prior to obtaining a use permit, the applicant will be required to obtain several variances from the Metro Board of Zoning Appeals, including landscape buffer requirements and parking requirements. |
| TRAFFIC | Based on typical uses in CS districts, approximately 6 to 186 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | Approve |



| Project No. Council Bill Associated Cases Deferral Staff Reviewer Staff Recommendation | Zone Change 2002Z-116U-10 None None Deferred by the applicant on 11-14-02 Scott <i>Disapprove. The proposed RS20 zoning is inconsistent</i> <i>with the Subarea 10 Plan's Residential Low (RL)</i> <i>Policy.</i> |
|---|---|
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 1.2 acres from Residential (R40) to Residential (RS20) at 4000 Wayland Drive. |
| Existing Zoning R40 zoning | R40 zoning is intended for single-family and duplexes at 1.3 units per acre. |
| Proposed Zoning RS20 zoning | RS20 zoning is intended for single-family at 2.18 units per acre. |
| SUBAREA 10 PLAN POLICY Residential Low (RL) | RL policy is intended to conserve large areas of established, low density (2 dwelling units per acre or below) subdivided residential development. The Subarea 10 Plan states the following: "In some sections in Green Hills and along Woodmont Boulevard, there have been smaller infill developments with densities higher than what conforms with that of surrounding areas. In some cases, dwelling types also have not matched the existing character of established neighborhoods. These types of developments are not recommended in the future and should not be used as a basis for similar projects in the areas where they presently exist. The intent of this plan is to ensure that future development of infill sites conform with the existing character of surrounding areas." (1994 Subarea 10 Plan, p. 49). "It is important to recognize that the potential for resubdivision does exist in parts of these areas, since the policy allows up to two dwelling units per acre. Much of the area is developed far below that threshold. However, the plan recommends that the prevailing character and densities of these areas be conserved. Any resubdivisions should result in densities close to |



| The second s | |
|--|--|
| | what exists in the surrounding area" (1994 Subarea 10 Plan, Pp. 49-50). |
| Policy Conflict | Yes. The Wayland/Beacon/Lynnwood block has a firmly established character, with larger lots and lower densities than some other areas developed according to RL policy. Because of this established character, allowing a zone change to RS20 would set a precedent contrary to the Subarea Plan. |
| | per acre, which is inconsistent with the RL policy's allowed density. |
| RECENT REZONINGS | None |
| TRAFFIC | Based on the number of dwelling units RS20 zoning would allow, two single family homes, approximately 19 trips per day could be generated by this use (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). |
| Metro Traffic Engineer's Findings | Approve |
| | |
| | |



| Project No. Council Bill Associated Cases Staff Reviewer Staff Recommendation | Zone Change 2002Z-119G-06 None PUD Proposal No. 2002P-008G-06 (Olde Mill) Mitchell Defer Indefinitely due to Incompleteness. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission act favorably on a rezoning and the adoption of a Planned Unit Development overlay on property that currently does not have road access. The Planning Commission is only required to act to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove a complete application. |
|---|--|
| APPLICANT REQUEST Existing Zoning | Rezone 126.72 acres from AR2a (agricultural) to R15 (residential) district |
| AR2a | AR2a permits one dwelling unit per two acres. It is intended for uses that generally occur in rural areas. Current zoning would permit 63 single-family lots. |
| Proposed Zoning R15 | R15 permits 2.5 single-family residential dwellings per acre. Proposed zoning would allow 312 lots. |
| SUBAREA 6 PLAN Natural Conservation (NC) | Specific criteria are set out in the <i>Land Use Policy Application</i> document for applying the NC policy and its range of densities to individual sites, based on their unique conditions. Areas of NC policy should be limited to very low-density residential development that is rural in character. These are lands isolated from urban/suburban areas, where there are steep slopes, floodplains, and a lack of urban services and facilities, including roads. The more environmentally sensitive and remote a site is, the lower the acceptable density. Some areas of NC policy are suitable for more intensive development, at up to four dwelling units per acre (Residential Low/Medium policy). These are lands that abut more intensively developed area(s), where slopes are less than 20%, there is little or no floodplain, and urban services and facilities, including streets are available. |



| | 3. Specific residential densities in NC areas should be determined by physical site characteristics and the availability of services, particularly sewers. |
|-----------------|---|
| | 4. Steeply sloping areas interspersed with narrow ridges and slightly wider valleys along streams are suitable only for very low intensity development. Valleys and accessible ridge areas may be suitable for residential development of up to four units per acre, but only if access can be accomplished without major grading and removal of native vegetation. |
| | Greenway plans affect this area and should be taken into account as part of the review of any development proposals involving sites in this area. |
| Policy Conflict | Yes. The proposed rezoning conflicts with the following policy directives for this area: |
| | Pursuant to items 1 and 2 above, the subject site is heavily encumbered by floodway and floodplain. More than 65% of the gross site is covered by floodway and floodplain. |
| | 2. There is not adequate sewer capacity to serve the proposed 308 dwelling units. In a letter from the Harpeth Valley Utilities District, dated October 2, 2002, the existing capacity would only support 142 units. The District has stated that any improvements to the sewer system must be designed with an initial pumping rate to serve 500 equivalent units and a final design flow rate to serve the total basin. This area is isolated from other urban areas, the availability of services and facilities is minimal, and the majority of the surrounding area is environmentally sensitive or constrained. Staff does not recommend approval of this rezoning request because it would act as a catalyst for additional development within this area of the NC policy. |
| | 3. Currently there is no road access to the subject site. Even if the applicant attains the ability to provide access, staff does not recommend approval of the rezone request to R15 because of the potential for extremely high trip generation onto a single, substandard roadway that is subject to regular flooding. |



| The second se | |
|---|---|
| Bellevue Community Planning | 4. The rezoning site falls in the middle of an NC policy area as opposed to falling along its boundary; it is environmentally constrained, rural in character, lacks transportation access, and, barring a connection to Coley Davis Road via a bridge over the Harpeth River, is isolated from areas of urban-suburban development. The site's characteristics prescribe very low-density residential development according to the application guidelines of the Natural Conservation policy. |
| Process | |
| | Although any future revisions to the Subarea 6 Policy have not been applied to this rezoning request, staff believes it is important to note that the Bellevue community has expressed a number of concerns regarding development within the Natural Conservation (NC) policy area. During the 2002 Subarea 6 Plan Amendment process, neighbors concluded that it was appropriate to maintain the current NC land use policy. Staff recommendations, however, are based upon the currently adopted Subarea 6 Plan. |
| | 1. Participants supported preserving the existing rural character of this area by protecting ridgelines, scenic roads, and environmentally sensitive areas (steep slopes, floodway/floodplains). |
| | 2. Subarea Plan Update participants strongly stated that new development in the Bellevue community should not be approved until substandard roads serving new development were improved to accommodate a development's traffic impact. |
| TRAFFIC IMPACTS | Subarea Plan Update participants indicated vigorously that new development in the Bellevue community should not be approved until existing substandard roads were improved to accommodate the new development traffic impacts. |
| | This rezoning site has one proposed access point to Newsom Station Road. The adjoining portion of Newsom Station Road is substandard and the only additional access to the proposed subdivision would be through a one-lane railroad underpass. Further, the proposed access travels through the Newsom Mill Park, which is park property under state and federal jurisdiction. To date, the applicant has not received |



| | official written approval from the state and federal governments to perform a land swap with the park in order to construct a roadway through the park property. Another potential access point is to Coley Davis Road by way of a new bridge across the Harpeth River. This route would need to be carefully reviewed by the Planning Department and Public Works Department because of the possible need to place this roadway connection within the Harpeth River floodway. |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Traffic Engineer's | "We have reviewed this proposal in the field and the |
| Findings | "We have reviewed this proposal in the field and the submitted traffic impact study. The existing access to this site (Newsom Station Road) includes substandard roadway geometry to the north and one-lane low clearance roadway underpass to the south. The applicant's Traffic Impact Study [TIS] indicates that a 3-way stop will be required on Newsom Station Road in order to provide safe access. In view of the above, we believe that the infrastructure is not adequate to support a rezoning or a PUD of this density at this time." |
| SCHOOLS Students Generated | <u>40</u> Elementary <u>30</u> Middle <u>25</u> High School |
| Schools Over/Under Capacity | Students will attend Gower Elementary School, Hill Middle School, and Hillwood High School. The Metro School Board has identified Hill Middle School as being over capacity at this time. |
| ALTERNATIVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION | Should the Planning Commission find that an action of approval, conditional approval, or disapproval is warranted at the meeting on December 12, 2002, staff recommends <i>disapproval</i> of the rezoning request because there is currently no access to the subject site and the requested number of units, in relation to the rural characteristics, lack of urban/suburban services, and significant environmental constraints, exceed the Subarea 6 Plan's Natural Conservation (NC) directives for very low-density development. Should the applicant successfully obtain access to the site via Newsom Station Road, Planning Department staff – as well as Public Works staff – believe that one point of substandard access would be inadequate for |



308 units and contrary to the Natural Conservation policy directives.



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 2002P-008G-06 Olde Mill Residential PUD None 2002Z-119G-06 Mitchell |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Defer Indefinitely due to Incompleteness. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission act favorably on a rezoning and the adoption of a Planned Unit Development overlay on property that currently does not have road access. The Planning Commission is only required to act to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove a complete application. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST _X_Preliminary PUDRevised IFinal PUDAmend PU | · |
| | Request for preliminary PUD approval for 308 single- family lots on 126.72 acres, at a density of 2.4 dwelling units per acre. |
| ZONING AR2a Zoning | AR2a permits one dwelling unit per two acres. It is intended for uses that generally occur in rural areas. Current zoning would permit 63 single-family lots |
| P.U.D. PERFORMANCE STANDARDS & PROVISIONS Section 17.36.050(A) | If encompassing environmentally sensitive areas, as defined by Chapter 17.28 of the Zoning Ordinance, approval of a PUD Master Development Plan shall be based upon a finding that the proposed development plan will result in greater protection and preservation of those areas than otherwise would result from development at the minimum protection standards of a conventional subdivision. |
| Section 17.36.060(G) | Alternative design standards may be sought regarding reduced setbacks. Reduced street and side-yard setbacks would allow for the provision of alleys behind some of the smaller lots. |
| | |



| 2 million | |
|-------------------|---|
| | of a conventional subdivision; however, the extraordinary protection of environmentally sensitive areas must be provided in return for such provision. |
| Section 17.36.090 | Development / Density bonuses are available and being requested based on the dedication of a Conservation Easement for the Master Greenway System. This provision allows for a 25% increase above the conventional density, yet requires that any development / density bonuses be derived from the land area being dedicated for public use. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The preliminary PUD plan proposes 308 single-family lots on 126.72 acres. Although this site is heavily encumbered by floodway and floodplain, the majority of all lots are located on the upland portion of the site, which is adjacent to Interstate 40. The plan proposes a mix of 42, 50, and 65-foot wide lots that are planned in an interconnected roadway grid. In addition, alleys are proposed at the rear of all 42-foot wide lots. The plan also proposes an internal park of approximately 100,000 square feet in size. This park is in addition to the proposed Conservation Greenway Easement and Greenway Trail that is proposed along the Harpeth River. Lastly, the plan proposes a clubhouse and amenities area in the northwest section of the site, just east of the Newsom Mill Park. |
| | In addition to the provision of alleyways, as requested by staff, the plan utilizes the ability reduce lot sizes below a conventional cluster lot subdivision by providing more environmental protection than would normally be provided. The plan proposes to retain 60% of the floodplain in a natural, undisturbed state. Although staff is not supporting the proposed lot yield, the applicant is using a development / density bonus available to him by dedicating lands for the Conservation Greenway Easement. This density bonus allows the applicant to add the number of lots that equate to 25% of the dedicated acreage; therefore, of the 41.8 acres to be dedicated, 25% of the lots at the requested zoning would be 26 lots. |
| TRAFFIC IMPACTS | This site has one, currently unavailable, access point – to substandard Newsom Station Road, in addition to another potential access point to Coley Davis Road by way of a new bridge across the Harpeth River. The |



| × 14.3 | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | route to Coley Davis Road would need to be carefully reviewed by the Planning Department and Public Works Department because of the possible need to place this roadway connection within the Harpeth River floodway. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | "We have reviewed this proposal in the field and the submitted traffic impact study. The existing access to this site (Newsom Station Road) includes substandard roadway geometry to the north and one-lane low clearance roadway underpass to the south. The applicant's traffic impact study [TIS] indicates that a 3- way stop will be required on Newsom Station Road in order to provide safe access. IN view of the above, we believe that the infrastructure is not adequate to support a rezoning or a PUD of this density at this time." |
| ALTERNATIVE STAFF | |
| RECOMMENDATION | Should the Planning Commission find that an action of approval, conditional approval, or disapproval is warranted at the meeting on December 12, 2002, staff recommends <i>disapproval</i> of the request to adopt a Planned Unit Development on this site because there is currently no access to the subject site and the requested number of units, in relation to the rural characteristics, lack of urban/suburban services, and significant environmental constraints, exceed the Subarea 6 Plan's Natural Conservation (NC) directives for very low- density development. Should the applicant successfully obtain access to the site via Newsom Station Road, Planning Department staff – as well as Public Works staff – believes that one point of substandard access would be inadequate for 308 units and contrary to the Natural Conservation policy directives. |
| | |



| Project No. Associated Case Council Bill Staff Reviewer Staff Recommendation | Zone Change 2002Z-121U-03 None None Hardison <i>Approve</i> |
|--|--|
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 0.6 acres from Office/Residential (OR20) to Commercial Limited (CL) at 2404 Brick Church Pike. |
| Existing Zoning OR20 zoning | OR20 zoning is intended for office uses and multi- family residential at 20 units per acre. |
| Proposed Zoning CL zoning | CL zoning is intended for retail, consumer service, financial, restaurant, and office uses. |
| SUBAREA 3 PLAN POLICY Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) Policy Conflict | CMC policy is intended for medium-high to high density residential and retail uses. None. The CL district is consistent with the intent of the CMC policy. This property is the last remaining parcel along this portion of Brick Church Pike that is not zoned CL. The existing OR20 zoning is also consistent with the CMC policy but the requested CL district is more in keeping with the character of the area. |
| RECENT REZONINGS | Yes. MPC recommended approved on 6/7/01 (2001Z- 053U-03) rezoning parcel 141 from R10 to CL. Metro Council approved the bill on 9/26/01. |
| TRAFFIC | Based on typical uses in CL districts, with on site parking and 10,000 sq. ft. of development per acre used to calculate traffic generation, such as a convenience market, office building, and retail apparel shop, approximately 166 to 4,437 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | No recommendations were received from the Public Works Department by the staff report deadline |



| Project No. Associated Case | Zone Change 2002Z-122G-03 None |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Council Bill | None |
| Staff Reviewer | Hardison |
| | |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 51.41 acres from Residential (RS15) to Agricultural (AR2a) at Ashland City Highway (unnumbered). |
| Existing Zoning | |
| RS15 zoning | RS15 zoning is intended for single-family dwellings at |
| | 2.47 units per acres. |
| Proposed Zoning | ADDa somina is internal of for somionity of the state |
| AR2a zoning | AR2a zoning is intended for agricultural uses and residential uses at 1 unit per 2 acres. |
| SUBAREA 3 PLAN POLICY | |
| Natural Conservation (NC) | NC policy is intended for mostly undeveloped areas of |
| | steeply sloping terrain, floodplains or other |
| | environmental features that are constraints to |
| | development at urban intensities. The area of these |
| | properties are around Whites Creek is classified NC due |
| | to both steep slopes and the floodway and floodplain of Whites Creek. |
| Policy Conflict | wintes Creek. |
| roney connet | None. The Subarea 3 Plan states: " <i>NC policy is applied</i> to the floodplains of Whites Creek and Ewing Creek because they are substantial floodplains that should be preserved to the greatest extent possible." By rezoning this property to AR2a the chance for a large residential development will be removed from this environmentally sensitive area. |
| RECENT REZONINGS | None |
| TRAFFIC | The proposed zone change would permit a total of 25 |
| | units. This number of units would create approximately |
| | 165 vehicle trips per day (Institute of Transportation Γ |
| | Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different |
| | densities could generate more or less traffic. |
| Troffia Engineer's | |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | No recommendations were received from the Dublic |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | No recommendations were received from the Public Works Department by the staff report deadline |



| - And | |
|---|--|
| SCHOOLS Students Generated | <u>4</u> Elementary <u>3</u> Middle <u>3</u> High School |
| Students Generated Schools Over/Under Capacity | <u>4 Elementary</u> <u>3 Middle</u> <u>3 High School</u> Students will attend Bordeaux Elementary School, Ewing Park Middle School, and Whites Creek High School. Whites Creek High has not been identified as being overcrowded by the Metro School Board, but Bordeaux Elementary and Ewing Park Middle have been identified as being overcrowded. |
| | |



| Project No. Associated Case Council Bill Staff Reviewer | Zone Change 2002Z-123U-08 None BL2002-1260 Hardison |
|---|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 0.28 acres from Industrial Restrictive (IR) to Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN) at 1402 4 th Avenue North and 300 Van Buren Street. |
| Existing Zoning IR zoning | IR zoning is intended for a wide range of light manufacturing uses. |
| Proposed Zoning MUN zoning | MUN is intended for a low intensity mixture of residential, retail, and office uses. |
| SUBAREA 8 PLAN POLICY Neighborhood Urban (NU) Policy Conflict | NU policy is calls for a mixture of residential and neighborhood scale commercial development. None. The Subarea 8 Plan defines this area as NU policy. This property is also within the Germantown Detailed Neighborhood Design Plan (DNDP). 1402 4 th Ave. North, is located within a Mixed Live/Work area of the DNDP. 300 Van Buren Street is located within an area of the DNDP that has two alternative land use categories: "Parks Reserves and other Open Space," and "Mixed Live/Work." The proposed MUN zoning is consistent with the intent of the NU and Mixed |
| RECENT REZONINGS | live/Work policy. Yes. The Planning Commission recommended approval to change parcel 14 from R6 to MUN on 10/24/02 (2002Z-108U-08). There has been no Metro Council action for this proposal as of yet. |
| TRAFFIC | Based on typical uses in MUN districts, this proposed zoning would generate approximately 13 to 67 trips per day (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | No recommendations were received from the Public |



| Zone Change 2002Z-124G-12 None None Hardison |
|--|
| Disapprove, but approve RS10 |
| Rezone 10.37 acres from Agricultural (AR2a) to Residential (R10) at 1000 Barnes Road. |
| AR2a zoning is intended for agricultural uses and residential uses at 1 unit per 2 acres. |
| R10 zoning is intended for single-family and duplexes at 3.7 units per acre. |
| RS10 zoning is intended for single-family houses at 3.7 units per acre. |
| RLM policy is intended for 2 to 4 dwelling units per acre. |
| The R10 district allows 3.7 units per acre, while 17.16.030(E) of the Code permits 25% of those units to be duplexes. The R10 allows more units, therefore, than the 2 to 4 units called for under the RLM policy. Pursuant to the description of zoning districts contained in 17.08.020(B)(1), the R10 district is "appropriate for implementing the residential medium density policies of the general plan," not the RLM policy that applies to this property. |
| Staff recommends <u>approval</u> of RS10 zoning for this property because RS10 zoning is consistent with the Subarea 12 Plan's RLM policy. |
| None |
| The proposed zone change would permit a total of 38 dwelling units, including 9 duplexes, for a total of 47 households. This number of units would create approximately 450 vehicle trips per day. The recommended RS10 zoning would permit a total of 38 households units, which would create approximately |
| |

| Metro Planning | Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 |
|--|---|
| | 364 vehicle trips per day. (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | No recommendations were received from the Public Works Department by the staff report deadline |
| SCHOOLS Students Generated R10 zoning RS10 zoning | <u>9</u> Elementary <u>7</u> Middle <u>5</u> High <u>7</u> Elementary <u>5</u> Middle <u>4</u> High |
| Schools Over/Under Capacity | Students will attend Maxwell Elementary School, Antioch Middle School, and Antioch High School, all of which have all been identified as being overcrowded. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |





| Project No. | Zone Change 2002Z-125U-11 |
|---|--|
| Council Bill | None |
| Associated Cases | None |
| Staff Reviewer | Leeman |
| Staff Recommendation | Disapprove. The proposed OL district is not consistent with the Subarea 11 Plan's RM policy calling for residential development at 4 to 9 dwelling units per acre. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | This request is to rezone 1.69 acres at Southgate Avenue (unnumbered) from single-family and duplex (R6) to office-limited (OL). |
| Existing Zoning | |
| R6 district | R6 is intended for single-family and duplex dwelling units at 6.2 dwelling units per acre. |
| Proposed Zoning | OL is intended for my lands intendit 60 |
| OL district | OL is intended for moderate intensity office uses. |
| SUBAREA 11 PLAN POLICY Residential Medium (RM) | RM policy is intended for residential development at 4 to 9 dwelling units per acre. RM policy was applied to this are with the intent of preserving the character and |
| Policy Conflict | integrity of this viable residential area. The Subarea 11 Plan was last updated on April 15, 1999. Yes. The Subarea 11 Plan's RM policy calls for |
| Toney Connict | residential development in this area, while office zoning would be inconsistent with this policy. The text of the Subarea 11 Plan states: "The present density is in the low end of the RM policy range and should be monitored so as to remain that way. Emphasis should be placed on stabilizing the area, particularly in the northern portion, through scattered site, owner-occupied infill development" (page 60, Subarea 11 Plan). |
| TRAFFIC | Southgate Avenue is a residential street east of this site and an industrial street west of this site. It is currently constructed with approximately 23 feet of pavement. |
| | Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual (6 th Edition), the proposed uses could generate the following number of trips per day on average: |
| | 55,000 square feet of office = 606 trips per day |
| Metro Traffic Engineer's Findings | No recommendations were received from the Public Works Department by the staff report deadline. |

| N CO |
|-------|
| NAS-C |
| |
| Trat |

| Project No. Associated Case Council Bill Staff Reviewer | Zone Change 2002Z-126U-08 None None Hardison |
|--|--|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 0.17 acres from Commercial Neighborhood (CN) to Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN) at 945 28 th Avenue North. |
| Existing Zoning CN zoning | CN zoning is intended for very low intensity retail, office, and commercial service uses at a neighborhood-scale. |
| Proposed Zoning MUN zoning | MUN is intended for lower intensity mixed-use development with bulk standards that are designed to maintain a residential-scale of development. |
| SUBAREA 8 PLAN POLICY Neighborhood Center (NC) | The NC policy is intended for mixed residential uses, civic activities, and low-rise public benefit uses. This property is also located in the Hadley Park Neighborhood detailed design plans Mixed-Use (MU) area. The MU policy calls for a mixture of residential uses and commercial uses at a residential scale. |
| Policy Conflict | None. The MUN district allows residential, commercial, and civic activities, which is consistent with the intent of the NC and the MU policy area. This property is located at the intersection of 28 th Avenue North and Albion Street, between I-40 and Hadley Park. Currently there is a vacant residence on the property, which is adjacent to structure that houses a small retail shop and a hair salon. The applicants are requesting this zone change because the existing CN zoning will not allow their proposed lodge hall. |
| RECENT REZONINGS TRAFFIC | None Based on typical uses in MUN zoning such as office, multi-family, retail or restaurant approximately 20 to 222 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. |
| Traffic Engineer's Finding | No recommendations were received from the Public Works Department by the staff report deadline. |



| 2 MAR | |
|--|--|
| Project No. Associated Case Council Bill Staff Reviewer | Zone Change 2002Z-127U-05 None None Hardison |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 0.76 acres from Commercial Neighborhood (CN) to Mixed Use Limited (MUL) at 103 and 105 Scott Avenue. |
| Existing Zoning CN zoning | CN zoning is intended for very low intensity retail, office, and commercial service uses at a neighborhood-scale. |
| Proposed Zoning MUN zoning | MUL is intended for a medium intensity mixed-use of residential, office and commercial uses. |
| SUBAREA 5 PLAN POLICY Residential Medium (RM) | The RM policy is intended for residential uses at 4 to 9 units per acre. |
| Existing Unmapped Commercial Node (RN) | The unmapped commercial node is intended to allow small pockets of neighborhood scale commercial development. |
| Policy Conflict | None. Although this property is located within the RM policy area of Subarea 5, the intersection of Eastland Avenue and Scott Avenue is considered an unmapped commercial node within the Subarea 5 Plan. The commercial node is designated to be compatible with the Retail Neighborhood (RN) policy, which allows for 30,000 to 100,000 square feet of commercial development. This property is currently zoned for commercial use. The property to the west on Eastland has been zoned MUL since 1996, so this proposed rezoning is not out of character with the area. |
| RECENT REZONINGS | None |
| TRAFFIC | Based on typical uses in MUL zoning such as office, multi-family, retail or restaurant approximately 89 to 992 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate |



more or less traffic.

Traffic Engineer's Finding

No recommendations were received from the Public Works Department by the staff report deadline.



| Project No. Associated Case Council Bill | Zone Change 2002Z-128U-10 None None | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Staff Reviewer | Hardison | | |
| Staff Recommendation | Disapprove | | |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Rezone 1.03 acres from Residential (R40) to Residential (R20) at 1920 A Woodmont Boulevard. | | |
| Existing Zoning R40 zoning | R40 zoning is intended for residential single-family and duplexes at 40,000 sq. ft. per lot. | | |
| Proposed Zoning R20 zoning | R20 zoning is intended for residential single-family and duplexes at 20,000 sq. ft. per lot. | | |
| SUBAREA 10 PLAN POLICY Residential Low (RL) | The RL policy is intended for residential dwelling units at no more than 2 units per acre. | | |
| Policy Conflict | Yes. The proposed rezoning would allow the construction of two duplexes, or four units on this 1.03 acre property, if the property is later subdivided. The Subarea 10 Plan specifically addresses a strip of RLM policy on both sides of Woodmont Boulevard just to the west of this property, which would allow densities of 2- 4 units per acre. The strip of RLM policy was "deemed necessary because of the impact from the busy Woodmont Boulevard / Hillsboro Road intersection. Benham Avenue is recommended as the eastern- most boundary of this area" (Subarea 10 Plan, page 49-50). Staff recommends disapproval of the proposed rezoning of this property because it is not consistent with the Subarea 10 plan for this area. | | |
| RECENT REZONINGS TRAFFIC | None With R20 zoning the applicant would be allowed to construct 2 single-family homes or 2 duplex units, which would create 4 living units. Approximately 19 to 23 trips per day could be generated by these uses (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. | | |
| Traffic Engineer's Finding | No recommendations were received from the Public Works Department by the staff report deadline. | | |



| SCHOOLS Students Generated | <u>0</u> Elementary | <u>0</u> Middle | <u>0</u> High |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Schools Over/Under Capacity | Students will attend Julia Green Elementary School, J.T. Moore Middle School, and Hillsboro High School. Julia Green Elementary, J.T. Moore Middle, and Hillsboro High Schools have all been identified as being overcrowded. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |



| Project No. Project Name Associated Cases Deferral Staff Reviewer | Subdivision 2002S-289G-14 Cobblestone Landing Subdivision None This case was deferred by the Planning Commission on 11-14-02 until the 12-12-02 Planning Commission Meeting. Scott | |
|---|---|--|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions | |
| APPLICANT REQUEST <u>X</u> Preliminary Plat | Preliminary & Final PlatFinal Plat Subdivide 38.25 acres into 71-lot Cluster Lot subdivision, at a proposed density of 1.86 dwelling units per acre. | |
| | The balance of this subdivision, an additional 103.7 acres, is located in Wilson County. The Wilson County portion of this subdivision received its final approval for zoning for a PUD on October 28, 2002 by Mt. Juliet City Commission. This property is proposed to have an additional 231 dwelling units, approximately 12,000 square feet of retail space that will be located near Old Lebanon Dirt Road, greenway trails, and a community center with a swimming pool. | |
| ZONING | The RS15 district requires a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet. | |
| CLUSTER LOT OPTION | The cluster lot option allows the applicant to reduce minimum lot sizes two base zone districts from the base zone classification of RS15 (minimum 15,000 square foot lots) to RS7.5 (minimum 7,500 square foot lots). Applicant has justified utilizing the cluster lot option by providing for additional open space and asserting that significant vegetation will be preserved in open space areas. Pursuant to Section 17.12.080(D) of the Metro Zoning Ordinance, open space provisions require a minimum of 15% open space per phase. The amount of open space required for this cluster lot subdivision is 5.74 acres. The applicant allows for 14.73 acres of open space or 39%, which exceeds the minimum open space requirements. | |



| Landscape Buffer Yards | The Cluster Lot Option within the Zoning Regulations allows perimeter lots abutting a conventional subdivision to be reduced in size the equivalent of one zoning district with the installation of a standard "B" landscape buffer yard, or perimeter lots may be reduced in size the equivalent of two zoning districts with the installation of a standard "C" landscape buffer yard. |
|---|--|
| | The proposed plat shows a standard "B" landscape buffer yard between the abutting southern property line from lot 2 to the edge of lot 26. All lots located along this property line are reduced one zoning district size. A "B" landscape buffer yard is located along the northern property line from lot 64 to lot 71, along the property line extending north from lot 64 and along the north property line extending east to the edge of lot 50. |
| SUBDIVISION DETAILS Street Layout and Design | Access to Cobblestone Landing is proposed from North New Hope Road. The Major Street Plan identifies North New Hope Road as a collector road. The Subdivision Regulations require 60 feet of right-of-way (ROW) for a collector road and 37 feet of pavement. Currently, North New Hope Road is not built to the standards. The applicant is dedicating the required 5 feet of ROW along the roadway. |
| | Public Works has identified a sight distance problem at the proposed location for the intersection. The applicant will reconstruct North New Hope Road. Approximately 7.5 feet will be removed from the hill to provide adequate sight distance and a southbound left turn lane will be constructed. |
| | Due to the development anticipated in Wilson County and along North New Hope Road, the northbound approach on North New Hope Road will be widened to include separate left and right turn lanes at the intersection with Old Lebanon Dirt Road. |
| | The plat proposes a street connection to the property to the east, in Wilson County, that is proposed for 231 dwelling units and commercial development. The plat also proposes two stub-out streets to the south for future development. |



| The second se | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Blue –Line Stream and Ponds | There is an existing blue-line stream located north of the property. The part of the mandatory 25' buffer located within the subdivision is preserved and located in the common open space of Cobblestone Landing. | | | |
| Critical Lots | Lots 38,39,56, 57, and 58 are labeled as critical lots. The critical lot regulations require that these lots have plans approved by the Planning Commission at the time of application for a building permit. No clearing or grading may take place on these lots prior to approval of the critical lot plan. | | | |
| SUBDIVISION VARIANCES | None | | | |
| TRAFFIC Traffic Study Submitted | Yes | | | |
| Traffic Engineer's Recommendation | Improvements should be completed as shown (on plans) at the intersection of New Hope Rd and Road A, which includes reconstruction of a hill profile and construction of a left turn lane on southbound New Hope Rd. As recommended in the traffic impact study, the northbound approach on New Hope Rd should be widened to include separate left and right turn lanes at the intersection with Old Lebanon Dirt Rd. Based on the volumes indicated in the traffic impact study, the location of attractions surrounding the proposed development in the Hermitage area, and the existing subdivision regulations we recommend that Road A be constructed to collector standards. <i>Note: Staff recently met with Public Works staff to discuss this recommendation. The applicant presented new data in the traffic study. Based on Pubic Work's analysis of the new traffic study, the traffic volume on Road A will not warrant construction of the road to collector standards.</i> To ensure the surrounding roadway network will be able to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development, we recommend that prior to constructing the connection between Davidson County and Wilson County that the connection to Old Lebanon Dirt Rd in Wilson County should be complete. This will also serve to provide improved | | | |



| in s d r n n in s | t is important to note that, as indicated in the traffic mpact study, portions of New Hope Rd "include substantial vertical curves that limit the sight listance available for motorists turning from oadways and driveways". The impact study also notes "the northernmost portion of New Hope Rd ncludes a significant horizontal curve immediately south of the intersection with Old Lebanon Dirt Rd". |
|---|--|
| 2. 1 c r a b c c 3. 1 S p 4. A t 5. 1 a p c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c | Subject to a revised plat prior to recordation. Che following road improvements must be completed or bonded prior to any final plat ecordation: Reconstruction of hill profile on North New Hope Road at intersection with Road "A". A left turn lane on southbound North New Hope Road. The northbound approach on North New Hope Road widened to include separate left and right turn lanes at the intersection with Old Lebanon Dirt Road. Road "A" is built to the Local Road standard in the Subdivision Regulations with 46' ROW and 23' of pavement as shown on the plat. Add note on final plat to all stub streets "Temporary urnaround, road to be extended in future." To ensure the surrounding roadway network will be able to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development, we recommend that prior to constructing the connection between Davidson County and Wilson County that the connection to DId Lebanon Dirt Rd in Wilson County should be complete. With the final plats for each phase, bonds will be needed for the extension of streets and sidewalks, public utilities and landscape buffer yards. |



| Project No. Project Name Associated Cases Staff Reviewer | Subdivision 2002S-300G-14 Towering Oaks Subdivision None Mitchell |
|---|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST <u>X</u> Preliminary Plat | Preliminary & Final PlatFinal Plat |
| | Subdivide 22 acres into a 54-lot Cluster Lot subdivision, at a proposed density of 2.45 dwellings units per acre. |
| ZONING | RS15 district, requiring a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet. |
| CLUSTER LOT OPTION | The cluster lot option allows the applicant to reduce minimum lot sizes two base zone districts from the base zone classification of RS15 (minimum 15,000 sq. ft. lots) to RS7.5 (minimum 7,500 sq. ft. lots). Although allowed to reduce minimum lot size two base zone districts, the applicant has chosen to use the RS10 district as the alternative lot size for bulk standard compliance since proposed lots range from 8,400 sq. ft. to 15,000 sq. ft. An applicant may choose to use the lowest alternative bulk standard because the proposed lots fall just above the minimum allowable lot size. The cluster lot option allows the applicant to use the alternative bulk standard that most closely resembles the alternative lot sizes chosen. Accordingly, the applicant in this case has chosen to utilize the RS10 district for alternative bulk standards. |
| | Applicant has justified utilizing the cluster lot option because a blueline stream, feeding into the Percy Priest Lake, crosses a significant section of the property to the rear. In addition, the applicant is proposing that 26% of the site will be preserved as natural vegetation or open space. Pursuant to Section 17.12.080(D) of the Metro Zoning Ordinance, open space provisions require a minimum of 15% open space per phase. |
| Landscape Buffer Yards | The cluster lot option allows perimeter lots abutting a conventional subdivision to be reduced in size the equivalent of one zoning district with the installation of |



| Dela. | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | a standard "B" landscape buffer yard located within common open space, or lots may be reduced in size the equivalent of two zoning districts with the installation of a standard "C" landscape buffer yard. The applicant proposes 25-foot standard "C" buffer yards, within lot boundaries, and 20-foot standard "B" buffer yards within common open space. |
| SUBAREA 14 POLICY | This subdivision falls within the Subarea 14 Policy's Residential Low Medium (RLM) policy, which supports a density range of about 2 to 4 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is proposing a unit density of 2.45 units per acre. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The plan provides for one point of access to the subdivision off Stewart's Ferry Pike; however, four additional points of access to the subdivision are provided to the north, east, and west. This application provides an excellent example of the traditional grid- type layout with multiple points of connectivity. In addition, sidewalks are proposed along both sides of all new roadways, in accordance with current Public |
| TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS | Works standards. |
| CONDITIONS | Staff recommends conditional approval of this plat subject to the submission of a revised plat: Add the following note, "Wheelchair accessible curb ramps, complying with applicable Metro Public Works standards, shall be constructed at street crossings." Performance bonds must be posted to secure the satisfactory construction, installation, and dedication of all required public improvements. |

| Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 | |
|---|--|
| Project No. Project Name Associated Cases Deferral | Subdivision 2002S-302U-12 Providence Park None This case was deferred by the Planning Commission on 11/14/02 until the 12/12/02 Planning Commission Meeting. |
| Staff Reviewer | Fuller |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | Preliminary & Final PlatFinal Plat Subdivide 43.8 acres into a 141-lot cluster lot |
| | subdivision, at a proposed density of 3.22 dwelling units per acre. |
| ZONING | R10 district requiring minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. |
| CLUSTER LOT OPTION | The cluster lot option allows the applicant to reduce minimum lot sizes two base zone districts from the base zone classification of R10 (minimum 10,000 sq. ft. lots) to R6 (minimum 6,000 sq. ft. lots). Proposed lots range from 6,000 sq. ft. to 16,297 sq. ft. |
| | Pursuant to Section 17.12.080(D) of the Metro Zoning Ordinance, cluster lot subdivisions require a minimum of 15% open space per phase. The applicant successfully complies with this requirement by proposing a total of 14 acres (32%) of open space – which exceeds the minimum open space acreage required. |
| SUBDIVISION DETAILS Critical Lots | There are 23 critical lots in this subdivision designated as critical lots due to steep topography, requiring individual review and approval of the grading plans for each lot by the Metro Water Services Stormwater Management division, Public Works, and Metro Planning Department staffs prior to the issuance of building permits. |
| Airport Impact | From the report <i>Final Noise Exposure Maps Submittal</i> <i>Documents 1996 and 2001 for the Nashville</i> <i>International Airport</i> it appears that the lower portion |



| - Aller | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Stormwater | of this property was located within the 65 DNL (Day- Night Average Sound Level) area in 1996 but was projected to not be affected by the 65 DNL in 2001. The reduction in noise levels is attributed to the retirement of old aircraft and the downsizing of flights by American Airlines. The subdivision proposal includes earth berms along the eastern boundary facing the airport to mitigate the impact of airport noise. Additional insulation requirements, if required, will be dealt with at the building permit application. The Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation has determined that a small watercourse that originates in the southern corner of the property, crosses under an old roadbed, and flows northward toward I-24 is a wet weather conveyance from the road bed upstream, and a intermittent stream from the road crossing downstream. The watercourse can be altered with the appropriate permits from TDEC. |
| TRAFFIC | |
| Traffic Study Submitted | Yes |
| Public Works Traffic Report | The TIS submitted for the Providence Park subdivision (formerly Woodland Hills - Phase 2) recommended no improvements would be necessary and that traffic generated from the proposed development would have little impact on the surrounding roadway network. However, it should be noted that the intersections analyzed in the TIS currently operate at Level-of- Service (LOS) D, E or F. Southbound left-turns on Linbar Drive currently operate at LOS F during the AM peak-hour. A contributing factor in the failing operation is the fact that left, through and right vehicles must all share one lane. According to the TIS, it is expected that 50% of the new development traffic (141 homes) will use the intersection of Linbar Drive and Harding Place. As a result, delay can be expected to increase for motorists on southbound Linbar Drive when the new development is complete. Therefore, the following recommendation should help to accommodate additional traffic generated by the Providence Park subdivision: |
| Traffic Engineer's Recommendation | A southbound left-turn lane should be constructed on Linbar Drive at the intersection with Harding Place. |
| | |



Approximately 28 to 30 feet of pavement width exist on Linbar Drive. Therefore, a full width widening will not be necessary. The approach should be widened to a 33foot width (3 - 11 foot lanes) for a length of approximately 100 feet, if possible. The appropriate pavement markings will also be necessary once widening is complete. This improvement can be delayed until the approval of the final plat of phase 2.

It should also be noted that due to the current lane configuration on southbound Linbar Drive, the traffic signal at the Harding Place intersection is required to operate as a split phase. With the addition of the new left-turn lane, a split phase will no longer be necessary. As a result, a more efficient signal operation will be possible. This will result in an improvement for the entire intersection, not just the traffic on Linbar Drive.

- 1. A southbound left-turn lane should be constructed on Linbar Drive at the intersection with Harding Place. The approach should be widened to a 33foot width (3 - 11 foot lanes) for a length of approximately 100 feet. The appropriate pavement markings will also be necessary once widening is complete. This improvement will be bonded with the final plat of phase 2.
- 2. With the final plats for each phase, bonds will be required for the extension of streets and sidewalks, public utilities and landscape buffer yards.

CONDITIONS

| - Add | |
|---|---|
| Project No. Project Name Associated Cases Staff Reviewer | Subdivision 2002S-329G-12 Indian Creek Addition Subdivision 2002S-082G-12 Sundown Green (formerly Greenway) Fuller |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST X_Preliminary Plat | _Preliminary & Final PlatFinal Plat |
| | Subdivide 43.35 acres into a 156-lot cluster lot subdivision, at a proposed density of 3.6 dwelling units per acre. |
| ZONING | RS10 district requiring minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. |
| CLUSTER LOT OPTION | The cluster lot option allows the applicant to reduce minimum lot sizes two base zone districts from the base zone classification of RS10 (minimum 10,000 sq. ft. lots) to RS5 (minimum 5,000 sq. ft. lots). The proposed lots range in size from 5,705 square feet to nearly 15,471 square feet. |
| | Pursuant to Section 17.12.080(D) of the Metro Zoning Ordinance, cluster lot subdivisions require a minimum of 15% open space per phase. The applicant successfully complies with this requirement by proposing a total of 8.85 acres (20.4%) of open space – which exceeds the minimum open space acreage required. |
| SUBDIVISION DETAILS Previous Application | Subdivision 2002S-082G-12 Sundown Green (formerly Greenway) was disapproved by the Planning Commission on April 25, 2002 primarily because thee subdivision proposal used Culbertson Road as its primary access. This proposal restricts access to Culbertson Road. |
| Critical Lots | This particular property contains steep slopes, and is within the Mill Creek floodplain. There are 48 lots in this subdivision designated as critical lots due to steep topography or flood plain, requiring individual review and approval of the grading plans for each lot by the |



| Dalla. | |
|---|---|
| | Metro Water Services Stormwater Management division, Public Works, and Metro Planning Department staffs prior to the issuance of building permits. |
| Greenway Easement | The developer will dedicate the Mill Creek floodway on the property as a public open space/conservation easement for the future Mill Creek greenway. |
| State Approval | A letter from the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation has been submitted to Storm Water Management authorizing the downgrading and alteration of a blue-line stream and draining of the farm pond that currently exists on the site. The letter goes on to state that extreme care must be utilized during this project to prevent any adverse impacts to Mill Creek. LAW Engineering and Environmental Services performed a survey for the federally endangered Nashville crayfish on the stream and farm pond. A letter has been submitted to Public Works indicating that the survey resulted in no collection of the Nashville crayfish. |
| Access | The Planning Commission approved rezoning this property in 1998 subject to no access from this property to Culbertson Road. The access to this subdivision will be through future phases of Indian Creek Subdivision to the east and Autumn Oaks Subdivision to the west. Currently, Stecoah Street and Santeelah Way in the Indian Creek Subdivision have been constructed up to the boundary of this property. However, these streets have not been platted. The development of this subdivision will be dependent on the platting of those streets. |
| TRAFFIC Traffic Study Submitted Traffic Engineer's Recommendation | No No access to Culbertson Road. |
| CONDITIONS | There will be no access to Culbertson Road, including construction traffic, until Culbertson Road is improved from Nolensville Road to Old Hickory Boulevard to the adopted Metro Standards for a Collector Road. All access to the site shall be through the neighboring |



subdivisions of Indian Springs and Autumn Oaks.

- 2. The developer will dedicate the Mill Creek floodway on the property as a public open space/conservation easement for the future Mill Creek greenway.
- 3. A sidewalk variance will be granted for Culbertson Road. Culbertson Road eventually will be closed to vehicular traffic in order to be a dedicated greenway trail. To add sidewalks in this section of Culbertson Road would require widening and construction of a curb and gutter system that would be unnecessary once the road is abandoned.
- 4. With the final plats for each phase, bonds will be needed for the extension of streets and sidewalks, public utilities and signage that will be located every 100 feet behind lots 142-156 indicating that a future greenway is planned in the area.

Item # 19

| | NGG/ |
|---|------|
| 1 | CS Y |
| | |
| 4 | THE |

| Subdivision 2002S-339U-10 Glen Echo Resubdivision of Lot 12 None Mitchell Disapprove as contrary to the Subarea 10 Plan's RL |
|---|
| (Residential Low-Density) land use policy and for failure to pass Lot Comparability tests for minimum lot size and minimum lot width. In addition, staff recommends disapproval of the requested sidewalk variance along Hillmont Drive. |
| C_Preliminary & Final Plat Final Plat |
| Subdivide a 0.89-acre tract into a 3-lot subdivision, at a proposed density of 3.4 dwellings units per acre, as well as a subdivision variance granting relief from requirements for sidewalk, curb, and gutter along existing roadway. |
| R10 district, requiring a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet |
| This subdivision falls within the Subarea 10 Policy's Residential Low-Density (RL) policy. The RL policy was applied to this area because it is developed residentially with densities at or below 2 dwelling units per acre. According to the Subarea 10 Plan, "the intent of this plan is to ensure that future development of infill sites conform with the existing character of surrounding areasand the plan recommends that the prevailing character and densities of these areas be conserved." The proposed plan provides a density of 3.37 dwelling units per acre. Even if one lot was removed, the density would still exceed 2 dwelling units per acre because the proposed density would be 2.24 dwelling units per acre. |
| The 0.89-acre tract lies along the north margin of Hillmont Drive, and just north of Glen Echo Road. The applicant is proposing three lots, ranging from 43.3 to 51.7 feet in width, and lot sizes ranging from 12,519 sq. ft. to 13,292 sq. ft. |
| |



| SUBDIVISION VARIANCES | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| (Sec. 2-6.1, Sidewalks) | The subdivision regulations require a 5-foot wide public sidewalk and a 4-foot wide grass strip along the frontage of the residential properties. The applicant has requested a sidewalk variance due to the absence of sidewalks along Hillmont Drive and the amount of roadwork that would be required to meet Metro Public Works sidewalk construction standards. |
| (Sec. 2-4.7, Lot Comparability) | Having run a lot comparability study for the proposed subdivision, staff finds that all three lots fail the minimum lot width requirement. The comparability test, which takes into account the lot frontage on lots within 300 feet of the subject lot, requires that each lot provide not less than 103 feet of lot frontage. Regarding minimum lot size under the lot |
| | comparability test, all three lots fail the test by not providing a minimum lot size of 28,230 sq.ft. |
| (Sec. 2-4.2[E], Lot Dimensions) | Each proposed lot does not pass the "4:1 Rule", which requires that the lot width, at the front yard line, shall not be less than 25% of the average lot depth. Based on the depths of the proposed lots, the 4:1 Rule calls for minimum lot widths – at the front yard line – to range from 59.6 feet to 63 feet. |
| TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS | Recommends approval |
| SIMILAR CASE | A similar case (Glen Echo, Resubdivision of Lot 17) was brought before the Metro Planning Commission in October of 1995 and then again in February of 1996. In both attempts, the application was disapproved by the Planning Commission because of failed lot comparability tests and because the requested subdivision was contrary to the General Plan. |



| Project No. Project Name Associated Cases Staff Reviewer | Subdivision 2002S-342G-12 Brookview Forest Subdivision None Mitchell |
|---|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions, subject to a variance to permit sidewalks along one side of the following streets: Brookview Court, Creekside Court, Creekside Lane, Brookview Place, Buckeye Court, and Ridgecrest Drive. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST X Preliminary Plat | Preliminary & Final Plat Final Plat |
| | Subdivide 56 acres into a 165-lot Cluster Lot subdivision, at a proposed density of 2.94 dwellings units per acre, and a sidewalk variance for the placement of sidewalks along both sides of proposed streets. |
| ZONING | RS10 district, requiring a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. |
| CLUSTER LOT OPTION | The cluster lot option allows the applicant to reduce minimum lot sizes two base zone districts from the base zone classification of RS10 (minimum 10,000 sq. ft. lots) to RS5 (minimum 5,000 sq. ft. lots). The applicant has chosen to use the RS5 district as the alternative lot size for bulk standard compliance since proposed lots range from 6,213 sq. ft. to 20,579 sq. ft. |
| | Pursuant to Section 17.12.080(D) of the Metro Zoning Ordinance, open space provisions require a minimum of 15% open space per phase. The applicant successfully complies with, and exceeds, this requirement by proposing anywhere from 18% to 31.5% open space per phase. |
| HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS Critical Lots | Pursuant to the Metro Subdivision Regulations, before application for a building permit on a lot designated as "critical", a plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission staff for approval. No clearing or grading may take place before approval of the critical lot plan and issuance of a building permit. |



| The second secon | |
|--|--|
| | Applicant has justified utilizing the cluster lot option because of the steep hillside topography associated with this site; however, even when utilizing the cluster lot option, the Hillside Development Standards of the Code only authorize lots on natural slopes ranging up to 25% subject to the hillside special standards and conditions. The applicant is proposing eleven lots that exceed a natural slope of 25%. The lots exceeding 25% range from 26% to 35% natural slope. As stated above, pursuant to Section 17.28.030(A)(2) of the Metro Code, "the Planning Commission may authorize lots on |
| | natural slopes ranging up to 25%, subject to the special standards and conditions noted above. Large contiguous areas containing natural slopes in excess of 25% should be recorded as common open space and permanently maintained in a natural state." |
| | In addition to the lots exceeding the 25% threshold, approximately 22 lots were not designated as critical when they contain a natural slope triggering the "critical" designation. Pursuant to Appendix C of the Metro Subdivision Regulations, "a lot will be designated critical when the lot is created on an up slope greater than 15% or a down or cross slope greater than 20%." |
| PLAN DETAILS | The plan provides three points of access to the subdivision by providing connections to Holt Road, Hickory Run, and a temporary cul-de-sac connection to the Melvin Barnes property (tax map 173, part of parcel 150). |
| Oliver Middle School | Based upon the future construction of Oliver Middle School, staff requested that the applicant provide a connection to Nolensville Road from the proposed subdivision. The applicant stated that a connection could be provided to Nolensville Road via the future development of the Melvin Barnes property; Oliver Middle School is scheduled to begin construction in spring of 2003 and open for classes the fall of 2004. Staff is not aware of any proposed development for the Melvin Barnes property and does not recommend postponing this necessary connection to Nolensville Road. |
| | |

| Metro Planning C | Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 |
|--|--|
| SUBDIVISION VARIANCES Sidewalk Variance | The applicant is seeking a subdivision variance for the construction of sidewalks along both sides of all roads within the proposed subdivision. |
| | Based on existing topographic conditions and the applicant's desire to minimize impacts on the hillside, staff partially supports the applicant's request to place sidewalks on only one side of the streets. Staff recommendation is that Brookview Court, Creekside Court, Creekside Lane, Brookview Place, Buckeye Court, and Ridgecrest Drive be provided with sidewalks on one side. Based upon the potential pedestrian activity along Brookview Forest Drive because of the Hickory Run and Holt Road access points, however, sidewalks should be placed along both sides of Brookview Forest Drive and Hickory Run. |
| SUBAREA 12 POLICY | This subdivision falls within the Subarea 12 Policy's Residential Low Medium (RLM) policy, which supports a density range of about 2 to 4 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is proposing a unit density of 2.95 units per acre. |
| TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS | Approve |
| CONDITIONS | Staff recommends conditional approval of this plat subject to the submission of a revised plat: All lots with a natural slope greater than 25%, in any direction, must be removed from the proposed lot count, recorded as common open space, and permanently maintained in a natural state. The 22 lots not designated as critical lots but within areas of significant slopes must be provided that designation. A roadway connection to Nolensville Road must be provided from Brookview Forest Drive. Sidewalks must be provided along both sides of Brookview Forest Drive and Hickory Run. Before application for a building permit on a lot designated as "critical", a plan must be submitted to the Planning Commission staff for approval. No clearing or grading may take place before approval of the critical lot plan and issuance of a building permit. |



- 7. Add the following note, "Wheelchair accessible curb ramps, complying with applicable Metro Public Works standards, shall be constructed at street crossings."
- 8. A temporary cul-de-sac must be provided at the temporary terminus of Brookview Forest Drive.
- 9. Revise the "This drawing is for illustrative..." note by removing the word 'appropriate'.
- 10. Performance bonds must be posted to secure the satisfactory construction, installation, and dedication of all required public improvements.

| Loca |
|------|
| |
| THAT |

| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Cases Deferral Staff Reviewer | PUD 155-74-G-14 Larchwood Commercial None None This item was deferred at the November 14, 2002, Planning Commission meeting in order to allow time for a community meeting. Leeman |
|---|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD X Revised F Final PUD Amend PU | Preliminary Revised Preliminary & Final PUD JD Cancel PUD |
| Existing Zoning CL/Commercial PUD | To permit 92,800 square feet of retail, restaurant, office, hotel and medical office uses in 8 buildings on 11.11 acres, replacing 87,200 square feet of retail and restaurant uses. Preliminary PUD plan is approved for 87,200 square feet of retail and restaurant uses on this portion of the PUD. The overall PUD is currently approved for 471,948 square feet, including retail, restaurants, gas station, office, car wash, hotel, and a building materials use. The underlying CL base zoning permits the proposed uses, while the preliminary PUD plan also permits these changes as a revision. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The proposed plan revises a portion of the existing PUD to change from a retail center containing a 38,000 square foot building materials store, a 43,100 square foot building with specialty shops retail, and restaurants to an office, 92,800 square feet of retail/restaurant uses, office, medical office, and a hotel use. Although this revision increases the square footage on this portion of PUD, it does not exceed 10% of the overall square footage last approved by the Metro Council, therefore, a PUD amendment is not required. The proposed plan provides the required landscape buffer yards separating this development from the adjacent residential subdivision, while the proposed uses are consistent with the CL base zoning and uses approved by the Council originally. |



| TRAFFIC Traffic Engineer's Findings | Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual (6th Edition) the proposed uses could generate the following number of trips per day on average: 59,000 square feet of office uses = 650 trips per day 14,000 square feet of retail = 596 trips per day The Metro Traffic Engineer is requiring the following traffic improvement to be completed or bonded prior to the recordation of a final plat for this phase of the PUD Provide left turn lane on Blackwood Drive to serve the proposed road and the proposed driveways. Removal of part of the existing median to accomplish this is recommended. |
|---|---|
| CONDITIONS | The following traffic improvement to be completed or bonded prior to the recordation of a final plat for this phase of the PUD: 1. Prior to final plat recordation for this phase of the PUD, a left turn lane on Blackwood Drive to serve the proposed road and the proposed driveways. Removal of part of the existing median to accomplish this is recommended. 2. Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwate Management Division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works shall forward confirmation of preliminary/final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. 3. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Code Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs. 4. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. 5. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been |



submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

6. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require reapproval by the Planning Commission.



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 9-77-U-12 Edmondson Commercial Center PUD Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market None None Mitchell |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with Conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | |
| Preliminary PUD Revised _X_ Final PUD Amend | |
| | Request for final PUD approval for the Edmondson Commercial Center PUD to allow for the reconstruction of a smaller grocery store. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The latest revision to the preliminary, approved on October 10, 2002, allows for the development of the 40,000 sq. ft. grocery store to replace the existing 60,000 sq. ft. store. The previous revision to the preliminary, approved in 1989, allowed for the development of a 60,000 sq. ft. grocery store, 11,000 sq. ft. of attached retail, and 1,800 sq. ft. of fuel service station. The construction of the grocery store and retail brought total square footage to 70,480, approximately 2,300 sq. ft. under the allowable maximum. |
| | The applicant's plan proposes a 39,910 sq. ft. grocery store, to be constructed by Wal-Mart, and proposes to leave the existing 10,480 sq. ft. of attached retail unaffected. A fuel pumping area was approved with the latest revision to the preliminary, but is not a part of this request for final PUD approval. Required parking for the fuel station can be accommodated within the existing parking lot. The only major revision to the parking lot is the proposed location of handicapped parking stalls directly in front of the grocery store. |
| TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS | Recommend approval. The applicant has proposed new sidewalks along Edmondson Pike in accordance with current Metro Public Works' design standards. |



CONDITIONS

Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02

| Before the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works shall forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. |
|---|
| 2. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs. |
| The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. |
| 4. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning |

Commission.
5. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require reapproval by the Planning Commission.



| do | |
|---|---|
| | |
| 11 × 8 1 | 7 |
| S. Salar I | |
| | |
| A Carrier and a | 1 |
| 110.000 | |
| 1111 | |

| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 113-78-U Mary Queen of Angels PUD St. Mary's Campus None None Mitchell |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| | reliminary Revised Preliminary & Final PUD Cancel PUD _ <u>X</u> Variance within a PUD |
| | Request for a variance to Section 17.32.090 (Community facility on-premises signs) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for an 11 foot 3 inch non- illuminated monument sign within the RM40 zoning district, which allows a maximum sign height of 8 feet. |
| PROPOSAL DETAILS | Since this sign is located within a Planned Unit Development district, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation on the requested variance to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). The BZA has jurisdiction over variance requests. |
| | The applicant is proposing an 11-foot, double-face, non-illuminated monument sign within the RM40 district. It is to be placed along White Bridge Road for the St. Mary's Campus. The applicant is not seeking a variance for the required street setback of 15 feet. This sign will be the only ground sign on the lot. |
| | Staff recommends approval of this variance because of the adequate street frontage and the fact that this will be the only monument sign for this facility along White Bridge Road. |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| Metro Planning (| Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 Item # 24 |
|---|---|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Cases Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 28-79-G-13 Hickory Manor Apartments Phase II None None Hardison |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD Revised P Final PUD Amend PU | reliminary <u>X</u> Revised Preliminary & Final PUD |
| Existing Zoning R15 | Revision to the preliminary and final PUD to permit the development of 68 multi-family units replacing the approved plan for 42 multi-family units. R15 is intended for single-family and duplex residential units at 2.47 units per acre. |
| PLAN DETAILS | This phase of the development was approved by the Metro Council for 240 multi-family units. Prior to the approval for the 42 units of Phase II, the developer had approval for 153 units. The applicant is now requesting to change the currently approved 42 units to 68 units, which will make the total development 221 units, or 19 units below the original Metro Council approved 240 units. |
| | The plan submitted shows 99 parking spaces. Current Code requirements for 48 two-bedroom and 29 three- bedroom units however, would be 146 parking spaces. See condition #1, below. |
| | The applicant is providing all required landscaping and drainage details. |
| TRAFFIC | Based on the proposed 68 units, approximately 448 trips per day could be generated by this use (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | Approve |



CONDITIONS

Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02

Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a revised final PUD plan must be submitted to Planning Department staff for review that meets current codes requirements for parking.
 Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works shall forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission.

- 3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits the recording of a revised final subdivision plat for parcels 365 and 128 on map 163 to provide a joint access easement from Hamilton Church Road through parcel 365 to 128.
- 4. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met.
- Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.
- 6. These plans, as approved by the Planning Commission, will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Deviation from these plans will require reapproval by the Planning Commission.



| - Melan | |
|--|---|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 103-79-G-14 Riverfront Shopping Center None None Scott |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD Revised P Final PUD Amend PU | reliminary <u>X</u> Revised Preliminary & Final PUD |
| Existing Zoning R10/Commercial PUD | This request is to revise a portion of the preliminary plan and for final PUD approval for a portion of the Commercial Planned Unit Development to permit a 13,500 square foot office and warehouse, with 6,000 square feet for office uses and 7,500 square feet for warehouse uses. This request replaces an undeveloped 15,000 square foot retail sales facility. The property is currently zoned Commercial PUD with a base zoning of R10. The existing Commercial PUD is a grandfathered plan approved for office, retail, ministorage warehouse and restaurant uses in 1979. This portion of the PUD plan is currently undeveloped. |
| TRAFFIC | Access to this parcel within the PUD is from an internal drive that intersects with Robinson Road. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | Approve |
| CONDITIONS | Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works must forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs. |



- 3. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits.
- 4. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.
- 5. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans is based upon the stated acreage. The actual number of dwelling units to be constructed may be reduced upon approval of a final site development plan if a boundary survey confirms there is less site acreage.



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 139-80-U-08 Schrader Acres Assisted Living Center None None Scott |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUESTPreliminary PUD Revised PFinal PUD Amend PU | |
| Existing Zoning R6/Residential PUD | This request is to revise a portion of the preliminary plan and for final approval to permit an assisted living facility with 26 units. This plan includes a future 12- unit addition to the facility. The 38 units replace 98 undeveloped units on the preliminary plan for phase II. The property is currently zoned R6/Residential PUD overlay. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The original Residential PUD was approved with 120 units and approximately 7.97 acres. Phase I of the approved PUD includes an independent living facility with 22 units and is already constructed and occupied. Since the original approval, Ed Temple Boulevard was constructed and now bisects the original PUD, leaving 4.08 acres on the south side of Ed Temple Boulevard within the PUD. The balance of the property, located on the northeast side of Ed Temple Boulevard within the PUD, was sold to the State of Tennessee Board of Regents. The approved uses in the PUD are independent living facilities and foster homes. The proposed plan is consistent with the approved preliminary plan in terms of building location, access, and uses. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | Approval |



| 2. 3. 4. | PUD approval. Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works must forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes |
|----------------|--|
| | Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs. |
| 6. | The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. |
| 7. | Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning |
| 8. | Commission. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans is based upon the stated acreage. The actual number of dwelling units to be constructed may be reduced upon approval of a final site development plan if a boundary survey confirms there is less site acreage. |



| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
|---|--|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 269-84-G Tulip Grove Center None None Scott |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD Revised Preliminary PUD Final PUD Amend PUD | reliminary <u>X</u> Revised Preliminary & Final PUD JD <u>Cancel PUD</u> |
| Existing Zoning | This request is to revise a portion of the preliminary plan and for final PUD approval for phase 3 of the Commercial Planned Unit Development to permit a 3,500 square foot financial institution with five drive- thru lanes, replacing an undeveloped 8,312 square foot retail facility. |
| R10 district/Commercial PUD | The property is currently zoned R10 with a Commercial PUD overlay. The existing Commercial PUD is a grandfathered plan approved in 1984. The proposed use for this PUD is consistent with the Council approved plan, which included an office use. This portion of the PUD plan is currently undeveloped. |
| PLAN DETAILS | Phase 3 of the Tulip Grove Center PUD contains floodway from Scott's Hollow Branch, a tributary of Stones River, on the southern portion of the parcel. The floodway is labeled on the final PUD plan as a conservation easement. At this time, the Parks Department has indicated there are no plans for a greenway and trail on this portion of Scott's Hollow Branch, therefore the Parks Department will not maintain this area. However, there is a possibility that a trail could be built in the future within the floodway and 50' buffer that will be protected with the easement on the property. |
| | The proposed plan is consistent with the approved preliminary in terms of building location, access, and uses. |
| TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS | Approval |



| CONDITIONS | 1 Prior to the issuence of any normity the Stormwater |
|------------|--|
| CONDITIONS | Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works must forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission. These plans as approved by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans is based upon the stated acreage. The actual number of dwelling units to be constructed may be reduced upon approval of a final site development plan if a boundary survey confirms there is less site acreage. |
| | |



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer Staff Recommendation APPLICANT REQUEST | Planned Unit Development 306-84-U Wilson Inn & Suites PUD None None Mitchell Approve |
|---|--|
| Final PUDAmend PU | reliminary Revised Preliminary & Final PUD JD Cancel PUD X_ Variance within a PUD Request for a variance to Section 17.32.130 (On- premises signs – CL, CS, CA, CF, SCC, SCR, IWD, IR, and IG) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a 75- foot pole sign within the CL zoning district. Section 17.32.130 allows a maximum on-premises sign height, in the CL district, of 50 feet if the site is located within 1,000 feet of a controlled access highway. |
| PROPOSAL DETAILS | Since this sign is located within a Planned Unit Development district, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation on the requested variance to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). The BZA has jurisdiction over variance requests. The applicant is proposing a 75-foot, double-face pole sign within the CL district. This sign will replace the existing pole sign as the only sign on the site. Staff recommends approval of this variance because of the significant grade change between the adjacent interstate and this site. The facility and associated sign are approximately 40 feet below the interstate. |

| NM . | |
|--|---|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Cases | Planned Unit Development 18-86P-14 River Trace Estates O88-215 None |
| Staff Reviewer | Hardison |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD Revised P Final PUD Amend PU | |
| Existing Zoning RS10 | Final PUD request to approve the proposed overflow parking lot/recreation area. |
| | RS10 is intended for single-family residential at 3.7 units per acre. |
| PLAN DETAILS | This portion of the PUD was created when the addition of right-of-way for the extension of Paddle Wheel Drive was approved. This property was originally designated as open space, but when the right-of-way was dedicated 6,100 sq. ft. were taken from this piece and it was change to overflow parking and recreational space. |
| | The overflow parking will provide 25 parking spaces. Of the 25 spaces, 3 will be adequate for small boat parking and other recreational vehicles. |
| | The applicant is also providing the required landscaping and buffering. |
| TRAFFIC Traffic Engineer's Findings | Approve |
| CONDITIONS | Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works must forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction |



must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits.

- Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.
- 4. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require reapproval by the Planning Commission.
- 5. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a final plat must be recorded including any necessary bonds for sidewalks and public improvements.
- 6. The Homeowner's Association must maintain all medians within the Public right-of-way and an agreement must be signed and approved by Public Works with any final plat that includes a median.

| Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 Item # 3 | |
|--|--|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Cases Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 88P-009G Autumn Oaks Phase 7 None None Hardison |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions. |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD Revised Prevised Previse | |
| Existing Zoning R20 | Final PUD request for 18 single-family lots at a density of 4.2 units per acre.R20 is intended for single-family and duplex residential units at 4.94 units per acre. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The proposed plan is for 18 single-family lots for phase 7 of the Autumn Oaks. |
| | The applicant is providing all required landscaping and drainage details. |
| TRAFFIC | Based on typical development with R20 zoning, approximately 172 trips per day could be generated by this use (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 6 th Edition, 1996). Other uses at different densities could generate more or less traffic. |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | Approve |
| CONDITIONS | Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works must forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met prior to the issuance of any building permits. |



- Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.
- 4. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require reapproval by the Planning Commission.
- 5. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a final plat must be recorded including any necessary bonds for sidewalks and public improvements.
- 6. The Homeowner's Association must maintain all medians within the Public right-of-way and an agreement must be signed and approved by Public Works with any final plat that includes a median.

| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Cases Staff Reviewer | PUD 88P-020G-04 The Woods of Neely's Bend, Phase 2 and 3 None None Leeman |
|---|--|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD Revised P Final PUD Amend PU | reliminary <u>X</u> Revised Preliminary & Final PUD JD Cancel PUD |
| Existing Zoning | To permit the development of 86 single-family lots in Phases 2 and 3 on 26.63 acres, replacing 92 single- family lots. This request is also for final approval for 23 single-family lots in Phase 2, while the applicant is only requesting preliminary approval for 63 lots in Phase 3. |
| RS40/Residential PUD | This is a grandfathered PUD approved by the Metro Council in 1988, for a total of 121 single-family lots, where Phase 1 has been given final approval for 29 single-family lots previously. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The proposed plan revises a portion of the undeveloped PUD plan approved in 1988. The proposed plan is consistent with the approved plan in terms of lot locations, street layout, and open space. The plan has been modified to accommodate slightly larger lots than were approved on the preliminary PUD plan. The lots in Phases 2 and 3 range in size from 5,000 square feet to 14,300 square feet. This is a grandfathered PUD approved under the previous zoning Code, where lots were permitted to be smaller than what the base zoning normally allows. |
| | The plan has also been revised to add sidewalks to both sides of the new roads within the development, where the original plan only had sidewalks on one side of each road. The Subdivision Regulations were changed in December 2000 to require sidewalks on both sides of all new roads. |
| TRAFFIC | Phases 2 and 3 will extend Comanche Run through Phase 1 of this PUD, while two additional public roads |



| Traffic Engineer's Findings | will be constructed to access Pawnee Trail and Ocoee Trail. No Exceptions Taken |
|--------------------------------|---|
| CONDITIONS | The following conditions will be made part of this approval: Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works must forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. This preliminary plan approval for the residential portion of the master plans is based upon the stated acreage. The actual number of dwelling units to be constructed may be reduced upon approval of a final site development plan if a boundary survey confirms there is less site acreage. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for Phase 2, a final plat must be recorded for Phase 2 including any necessary bonds for public improvements and including the consolidation of parcel 126 into parcel 127 and the remainder of the PUD. |

| Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 | |
|---|--|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Cases Staff Reviewer | PUD 88P-068G-13 Nashboro Square None None Leeman |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUDX_ Revised P Final PUD Amend PU | reliminary Revised Preliminary & Final PUD D Cancel PUD |
| Existing Zoning R10/Commercial PUD | To permit a redesign of a phase to permit 56,000 square feet of retail, restaurant, and bank uses, replacing 90,100 square feet of retail uses on the approved plan. This is a grandfathered PUD approved by the Metro Council in 1988, for a total of 242,100 square feet of commercial uses. The portion of the plan proposed to be revised was approved for 90,100 square feet of retail uses. |
| PLAN DETAILS | The proposed plan revises a portion of the undeveloped PUD plan approved in 1988. The proposed plan is consistent with the approved plan in terms of building layout, access, and landscape buffer yards. The proposed plan provides one access point directly to Murfreesboro Pike and one access point to Brooksboro Place. Since the proposed plan decreases the square footage on this portion of the plan, a PUD amendment is not required. |
| | The proposed plan provides the required landscape buffer yards separating this development from the adjacent residential property and it includes the required masonry wall that was made a condition of the original preliminary PUD plan. |
| TRAFFIC | Based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual (6 th Edition), the proposed uses could generate the following number of trips per day on average: |
| | 4,000 square feet of office 51,000 square feet of retail= 44 trips per day = 2,189 trips per day |
| Traffic Engineer's Findings | The Metro Traffic Engineer has made the following comments: "Determination is to be made by traffic |



| | engineer if the old traffic impact study, requires this phase of the development to trigger the requirements for any offsite improvements. If it does not then plan is OK." Planning Department staff has researched the conditions of the original traffic impact study and determined that no additional road improvements were required at this stage of development. Staff notes, however, that the study is 14 years old and likely does not reflect current traffic conditions in that area. |
|------------|--|
| CONDITIONS | The following conditions will be made part of this approval: Any final PUD plan must include a wall, 6-feet in height at the rear of Lot A, as required on the original PUD approval. Compliance with the provisions of the 1988 traffic impact study as approved by the Metro Traffic Engineer. Prior to the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management Division of Metropolitan Water Services and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works must forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs. Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission. These plans as approved by the Planning commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require reapproval by the Planning Commission. |

| Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 | |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |

| Juda C |
|---------------------------------------|
| 124 |
| A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A |

| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Planned Unit Development 93P-023G-14 Gateway of Hermitage Commercial PUD <i>Wiltruco Credit Union</i> None None Mitchell | |
|---|---|--|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with Conditions | |
| APPLICANT REQUEST Preliminary PUD Revised Pr X Final PUD Amend PU | · <u> </u> | |
| PLAN DETAILS | The latest revision to the preliminary, approved on November 14, 2002, allows for the development of the 3,164 sq. ft. financial institution. The previous revision to preliminary, in 1997, allowed for the development of a 6,000 sq. ft. restaurant and a 69,000 sq. ft., 6-story, 144-room motel. The hotel has since been developed. The applicant's plan proposes a 3,164 sq. ft. credit union facility to be constructed on the corner of Central Pike and Shurguard Way, in what is designated as phase two of the PUD. Ingress and egress to the site will be provided via direct access off of Shurguard Way as well as via the motel access drive. Required parking for the facility is 16 spaces. A total of 18 spaces are provided, which includes handicapped spaces – of which both handicapped spaces are properly located directly in front of the building entrance. | |
| TRAFFIC ENGINEER'S FINDINGS | Recommend approval. The applicant has proposed a new sidewalk along Shurguard Way in accordance with current Metro Public Works design standards. A sidewalk currently exists along Central Pike. | |
| CONDITIONS | A final plat needs to be recorded before the issuance of any building permits. | |



Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02

- 2. Before the issuance of any permits, the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works shall forward confirmation of final approval of this proposal to the Planning Commission.
- 3. This approval does not include any signs. Business accessory or development signs in commercial or industrial planned unit developments must be approved by the Metropolitan Department of Codes Administration except in specific instances when the Metropolitan Council directs the Metropolitan Planning Commission to approve such signs.
- 4. The requirements of the Metropolitan Fire Marshal's Office for emergency vehicle access and fire flow water supply during construction must be met before the issuance of any building permits.
- Authorization for the issuance of permit applications will not be forwarded to the Department of Codes Administration until four (4) additional copies of the approved plans have been submitted to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.
- 6. These plans as approved by the Planning Commission will be used by the Department of Codes Administration to determine compliance, both in the issuance of permits for construction and field inspection. Significant deviation from these plans will require reapproval by the Planning Commission.

| Metro Planning | Commission | Meetina | of 12/12/02 | |
|----------------|---------------------|---------|-------------|--|
| | <i>y</i> oommission | meeting | | |

| CO A |
|---------------------------------------|
| X 13.10 |
| |
| |
| A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A |

| NAM . | |
|--|---|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Mandatory Referral 2002M-124U-08 Disposition of Property by Metro Government – Map 92-01, Parcel 50 BL2002-1280 None Mitchell |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | An ordinance approving the disposition of a certain parcel (parcel 50) of surplus property to the adjacent property owner, property currently held by the Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County. |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS | None |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None |
| RECOMMENDATION | All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval. |

| Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 | | |
|--|--|--|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Mandatory Referral 2002M-125U-07 Ingress-Egress Driveway Easement Abandonment – 400 Hathaway Court None None Mitchell | |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve | |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | A request to abandon a portion of an existing ingress- egress driveway easement, for Project No. 02-SG-159, located at 400 Hathaway Court. | |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS | None | |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None | |
| | approval. | |

| Metro Planning | Commission | Meeting of 12/12/02 |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|
| metro i lanning | 0011111331011 | |

| N CC2 |
|-------|
| 13.1 |
| |
| |
| |

| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer Staff Recommendation | Mandatory Referral 2002M-126U-13 Donation of property for Metro Greenway System – 4640 Cummings Park Drive BL2002-1282 None Mitchell <i>Approve</i> |
|--|--|
| APPLICANT REQUEST | An Ordinance authorizing the Director of Public Property to accept ownership of a certain part of Tax Map 148, Parcel 79 for the use and benefit of the Greenway Commission, to construct a portion of the Mill Creek Greenway System, with the property located at 4640 Cummings Park Drive. |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS | None |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None |
| RECOMMENDATION | All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval. |



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Mandatory Referral 2002M-127G-01 Property Transfer to Metro Water Services BL2002-1281 None Mitchell |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | An Ordinance approving the disposition of a certain parcel of property by the Director of Public Property, held by the Metropolitan Government of Nashville & Davidson County at 7100 Whites Creek Pike, Joelton, TN, to the Metro Department of Water Services for construction of a water storage reservoir. |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS | None |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None |
| RECOMMENDATION | All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval. |



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Mandatory Referral 2002M-128U-07 Rename a portion of Old Hickory Boulevard to Annex Avenue None None Mitchell |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | A request by the Assistant Director of Public Works to rename a portion of Old Hickory Boulevard, from Charlotte Pike to the existing Annex Avenue (on the other side of Interstate 40), to Annex Avenue to reduce the amount of segmentation of Old Hickory Boulevard and for improved E911 emergency efficiency and response. |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS | None |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None |
| RECOMMENDATION | All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval. |

Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02

| - And - | |
|---|--|
| Project No. Project Name | Mandatory Referral 2002M-129U-09 Sidewalk Surface Encroachment for The Harmitage Hetel |
| Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | The Hermitage Hotel None Mitchell |
| Staff Recommendation | <i>Conditional Approval, subject to receiving all department approvals.</i> |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | A request to install a granite decorative inlay in the sidewalk fronting the 6th Avenue North entrance of The Hermitage Hotel, measuring 14 feet by 8 feet, requested by The Hermitage Hotel, applicant and property owner. |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS | |
| License to Encroach Agreement | Yes – one was submitted in correct form. |
| Insurance Certificate | Yes – one was submitted providing general liability of \$1,000,000 for each occurrence and \$2,000,000 for general aggregate coverage, as allowed by Metro Legal. |
| Property Owner Sign Application | Yes |
| Tenant Sign Application | N/A |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None |
| RECOMMENDATION | Conditional Approval, subject to receiving all department approvals. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02 | |
|--|---|
| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Mandatory Referral 2002M-130U-07 Close a portion of Alley #1534 None None Mitchell |
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | A request to close a portion of Alley #1534 from Westboro Drive to the alley's western terminus, requested by St. John's UMC - Eddie Porter, Trustee, for Wayne A. Greer, St. John's United Methodist Church, and Dale S. Watson, abutting property owners. |
| | (Easements are to be abandoned) |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS <i>Application properly completed and</i> <i>signed?</i> | Yes |
| Abutting property owners sign application? | Yes |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None |
| RECOMMENDATION | All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Mandatory Referral 2002M-131U-09 Close a portion of Alley #98 None None Mitchell |
|--|--|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | A request to close a portion of Alley #98 between Division Street north to Alley #196, requested by Judith A. Swindell, for Norman & Judith Kale & Co., LLC, abutting property owner. |
| | (Easements are to be retained) |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS <i>Application properly completed and</i> <i>signed?</i> | Yes |
| Abutting property owners sign application? | Yes |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | None |
| RECOMMENDATION | All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval. |

Metro Planning Commission Meeting of 12/12/02

Item # 42



| Project No. Project Name Council Bill Associated Case Staff Reviewer | Mandatory Referral 2002M-132U-10 Close a portion of Boview Lane None None Mitchell |
|--|---|
| Staff Recommendation | Approve with conditions |
| APPLICANT REQUEST | A request to close a portion of Boview Lane between Skyline Drive and Wallace Lane, requested by David Heusinkveld, for Regan A. Logan, Carl & Silvine Hudson, James A. Horrell, Keri A. Underwood, and Roland Stein, abutting property owners. |
| | (Easements are to be retained) |
| APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS Application properly completed and signed? | Yes |
| Abutting property owners sign application? | Yes |
| DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS | This right-of-way has never been improved as a roadway and is not a part of the adopted 2002-2007 Capital Improvements Budget. Although the Subdivision Regulations strongly encourage the interconnectedness of roadways between subdivisions the closure of this right-of-way will not negatively affects the existing roadway network. However, in order to retain local community connectivity, staff recommends that a 10-foot bicycle and pedestrian easement be retained if the right-of-way is closed. |
| RECOMMENDATION | All reviewing departments and agencies recommend approval. |