

MINUTES
OF THE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: April 2, 1998
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Place: Howard Auditorium

Roll Call

Present:

Gilbert N. Smith, Chairman
Tim Garrett, Councilmember
William Harbison
James Lawson
William Manier
Ann Nielson
Marilyn Warren

Absent:

Mayor Philip Bredesen
Arnett Bodenhamer
Stephen Smith

Others Present:

Executive Office:

T. Jeff Browning, Executive Director
Carolyn Perry, Secretary II

Current Planning & Design Division:

Ed Owens, Planning Division Manager
Theresa Carrington, Planner III
Jennifer Regen, Planner III
Doug Delaney, Planner I
Charles Hiehle, Planning Technician II

Community Plans Division:

Jerry Fawcett, Planning Division Manager

Advance Planning & Design:

John Boyle, Planning Division Manager
Mike Calleja, Planner III
Jeff Lawrence, Planner III
Jackie Blue, Planner I
Michelle Kubant, Planner I
Josh Rechkemmer, Planning Technician I

Others Present:

Jim Armstrong, Public Works

Chairman Smith called the meeting to order.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Owens announced Subdivision No. 90P-008G should be 93P-008G.

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Lawson seconded the motion, which unanimously passed, to approve the agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEFERRED ITEMS

At the beginning of the meeting, staff listed the deferred items as follows:

98M-029u Deferred two weeks, by applicant and councilmember.

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Lawson seconded the motion, which unanimously passed, to defer the items listed above.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Lawson moved and Ms. Nielson seconded the motion, which unanimously passed to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of March 19 1998.

RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

No councilmembers were present to speak at this point in the agenda.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Lawson moved and Ms. Nielson seconded the motion, which unanimously carried, to approve the following items on the consent agenda:

ZONE CHANGE PROPOSALS:

Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-053G
Map 108, Parcels 196 (1.78 acres) and 247
Map 121, Parcel 185 (11.88 acres)
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 13 (French)

A request to change from R10 to RS7.5 District property located at 1367 Bell Road, at the southern terminus of Timber Valley Drive (13.66 acres), requested by MEC, Inc., appellant, for Joe D. Smith, owner.

Resolution No. 98-211

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-053G is **APPROVED**:

The property falls within the Subarea 14 Plan's Residential Medium (RM) policy which permits between 4 and 9 dwelling units per acre. The proposed RS7.5 District will implement RM policy at the low end of the policy range by permitting approximately 5 dwelling units per acre."

Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-054U

Map 82-9, Parcels 203 (.17 acres) and 204 (.09 acres)
Subarea 8 (1995)
District 20 (Haddox)

A request to change from IR to MUN District properties located at 1325 and 1329 Third Avenue North, abutting the southwest margin of Taylor Street and Third Avenue North (.26 acres), requested by Raymond D. Lane, Sr., appellant, for Frank A. Wilk, Jr., owner.

Resolution No. 98-212

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-054U is **APPROVED**:

The property falls within the Subarea 8 Plan's Mixed Use policy calling for a mixture of commercial, residential, office and retail uses which the proposed MUN District implements."

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICTS:

Proposal No. 1-74-G

Shop at Home (Hickory Hollow Mall)
Map 163, Parcels 229 and 378
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 28 (Hall)

A request to revise the final site development plan of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the northeast corner of Mt. View Parkway and Hickory Hollow Parkway (11.51 acres), classified SCR and R10, to permit the addition of three satellite dishes for use by the Shop at Home Network, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, for Partners/Sath, LLC.

Resolution No. 98-213

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 1-74-G is given **FINAL APPROVAL (7-0)**.

Proposal No. 125-78-U

Goodyear
Map 163, Parcel 273
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 31 (Alexander)

A request for final approval for a portion of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the east margin of Cane Ridge Road, approximately 600 feet south of Bell Road (0.71 acres), classified SCR, to permit the development of a 5,490 square foot auto service facility, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., for Henderson Investment Group, owners. (Deferred from meeting of 3/5/98).

Resolution No. 98-214

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 125-78-U is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of final approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. The relocation of an existing drainage easement through the site by Metro Council Ordinance, prior to the issuing of any building permit.”

Proposal No. 154-79-U
Lions Head Village West
Map 103-14, Parcel 115
Subarea 7 (1994)
District 24 (Johns)

A request to revise the preliminary site development plan and for final approval for a portion of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the north margin of White Bridge Pike, opposite Brookwood Terrace (12.49 acres), classified SCC, to permit the addition of 2,072 square feet to the existing Target, requested by Southeastern Engineers, Inc., for Dayton Hudson Corporation, owner.

Resolution No. 98-215

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 154-79-U is given **CONDITIONAL PRELIMINARY AND FINAL APPROVAL (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of preliminary and final approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. Abandonment of the existing water main by Metro Council prior to the issuance of any building permits.”

Proposal No. 79-81-U
Bell Forge Shopping Center (Player’s Draft House)
Map 163, Part of Parcel 295
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 28 (Hall)

A request to revise a portion of the final site development plan of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located at the southeast quadrant of Bell Road and Bell Forge Lane (1.0 acre), classified AR2a, to permit the conversion of 13,300 square feet of an existing retail building (Media Play) to a restaurant, requested by Dennis L. Hoepfner, for Media Play, owner. (Deferred from meetings of 3/5/98 and 3/19/98).

Resolution No. 98-216

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 79-81-U is given **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR A REVISION TO FINAL (7-0)**. The following condition applies:

Written confirmation of final approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

Proposal No. 298-84-U

Riverstone

Map 85-14-A, Parcels 100, 102, 104, 106, 108 and 110

Subarea 14 (1996)

District 14 (Stanley)

A request to revise a portion of the final approval of the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the north margin of Lebanon Pike, approximately 400 feet east of Guill Court (7.45 acres), classified R10, to permit the development of six residential units, requested by Dale and Associates, Inc., for Calider Development Group, L.P., owners.

Resolution No. 98-217

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 298-84-U is given **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF REVISION TO FINAL (7-0)**. The following condition applies:

Written confirmation of final approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering sections of the Metropolitan Department of public Works.”

Proposal No. 97P-003U

Sterling Oaks (formerly Cloverland Ridge)

Map 172, Parcel 3

Subarea 12 (1997)

District 32 (Jenkins)

A request to revise the approved preliminary site development plan and for final approval of the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the north margin of Cloverland Drive, approximately 900 feet west of Edmondson Pike (28 acres), classified RS20, to permit the development of 75 single-family lots, requested by Bledsoe Engineering, for DBA/Advantage Builders, owner.

Resolution No. 98-218

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 97P-003U is given **APPROVAL OF REVISION TO PRELIMINARY AND CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of final approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. Designation of lots 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 23, 25 through 32, 43, 44, 56, and 65 through 72 as critical lots. All critical lot plans shall be signed and stamped by a certified professional engineer. If upon review of the critical lot plan, the planning commission staff determines that more detailed information is necessary, the applicant shall provide the appropriate information to the staff. The staff may request the assistance of the Department of Public Works for review of the critical lot plan. If it is determined necessary by the Department of Public Works, a grading permit may be required.
3. The recording of a final subdivision plat upon the bonding of all required improvements including a left turn lane on Cloverland Drive.
4. The recording of a boundary plat.”

Proposal No. 97P-010U

Bayview Estates
Map 136, Parcel 3
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 27 (Sontany)

A request to revise the preliminary site development plan and for final approval of the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the western terminus of Harbor Lights Drive, 600 feet north of Smith Springs Road (28.10 acres), classified R10, to permit the development of 138 single-family lots, requested by Gresham-Smith and Partners, for Bayview Ventures, LLC, owner.

Resolution No. 98-219

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 97P-010U is given **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF A REVISION TO THE PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN AND CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of preliminary and final approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. In accordance with the private agreement dated March 19, 1997, between Bayview Ventures, LLC and Watercrest, LLC, this developer shall pay a proportionate share of the cost of the northbound right-turn lane on Bell Road at the Smith Springs Road intersection. Payment toward the construction of this right-turn lane shall occur prior to the issuance of any building permits.
3. The northbound left-turn lane on Bell Road at Harbor Lights Drive, which was a part of the Bayview Subdivision approval, shall be constructed or bonded prior to the issuance of any building permits.”

SUBDIVISIONS:

Final Plats:

Subdivision No. 97S-436U

Bellwood, Resubdivision of Lots 2, 3, 4 and 7
Map 104-13, Parcels 211, 213, 214 and 215
Subarea 10 (1994)
District 25 (Kleinfelter)

A request to reconfigure 2 lots and relocate a 10 foot public utility easement abutting the east margin of Bowling Avenue and the south margin of Valley Vista Road (.79 acres), classified within the R8 District, requested by Keith Perryman, owner/developer, Land Surveying, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 98-220

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 97S-436U, is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (7-0)**.”

Subdivision No. 98S-098G

Summit Run, Phase 2
Map 86, Part of Parcel 39
Subarea 14 (1996)

District 12 (Ponder)

A request for final plat approval to create 22 lots abutting the northeast corner of Old Lebanon Dirt Road and Chandler Road (5.66 acres), classified within the R15 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Summit Run, L.L.C., owner/developer, H & H Land Surveying, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 98-221

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-098G, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$244,000.00 (7-0).”**

Subdivision No. 98S-100U
National Baptist Publishing Board
Map 104-6, Parcels 164-168
Subarea 10 (1994)
District 18 (Clifton)

A request for final plat approval to consolidate four lots into one lot abutting the southeast margin of West End Avenue, approximately 235 feet southwest of 33rd Avenue South (1.68 acres), classified within the RM40 and ORI Districts, requested by National Baptist Publishing Board, owner/developer, Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 98-222

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-100U, is **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (7-0).”**

Subdivision No. 98S-103U
Williamsburg at Brentwood, Section 2
Map 171, Parcel 176
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 32 (Jenkins)

A request for final plat approval to create 15 lots abutting the south margin of Cloverland Drive, approximately 151 feet west of Saddlewood Lane (7.16 acres), classified within the R40 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Randall Phillips Homes, LLC, owner/developer, Anderson-Delk and Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 98-223

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-103U, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$158,500.00 (7-0).”**

Subdivision No. 98S-105U
Metropolitan Industrial Park, Phase 2, Section 22
Map 95-14, Parcels 118 and 123
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 15 (Dale)

A request for final plat approval to reconfigure three lots into two abutting the southwest corner of Elm Hill Pike and Air Lane Drive (6.76 acres), classified within the IR and OR20 Districts, requested by Vallett Family Partners, Ltd., owner/developer, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 98-224

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-105U, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

Subdivision No. 98S-110U
4-J, L.P. Subdivision
Map 92-12, Parcels 217-221
Subarea 10 (1994)
District 19 (Sloss)

A request for final plat approval to consolidate four lots into two lots located between State Street and Church Street Alley, approximately 120 feet west of McMillin Street (.78 acres), classified within the CF District, requested by 4-J, Limited Partnership, owner/developer, Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 98-225

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-110U, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

Request for Bond Extension:

Subdivision No. 96S-342U
Keystone Farms
Keystone Partners, Inc., principal

Located abutting the east margin of Edmondson Pike, approximately 440 south of Huntington Parkway.

Resolution No. 98-226

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for extension of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 96S-342U, Bond No. 97BD-040, Keystone Farms in the amount of \$5,000 to 6/1/98 subject to submittal of a letter from the Fidelity and Deposit Company of Maryland by **5/2/98** agreeing to the extension. **Failure of principal to provide amended security documents shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**"

Subdivision No. 94P-021G
Hanover Park of Sheffield
Phillips Builders, Inc., principal

Located abutting the west margin of Somerset Place and the north terminus of River Fork Drive.

Resolution No. 98-227

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for extension of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 94P-021G, Bond No. 96BD-010, Hanover Park of Sheffield in the amount of \$170,200 to 6/1/98 subject to submittal of a letter from the Frontier Insurance Company by **5/2/98** agreeing to the extension. **Failure of principal to provide amended security documents shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**"

Subdivision No. 97S-079G
Lake Park, Section 12
Lake Park, Section 12, LLC, principal

Located abutting the southeast terminus of Helena Bay Court, approximately 200 feet southeast of Bayside Lane.

Resolution No. 98-228

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for extension of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 97S-079G, Bond No. 97BD-056, Lake Park, Section 12, in the amount of 98,500 to 5/15/98 subject to submittal of an amendment to the present Letter of Credit by **5/2/98** which extends its expiration date to 11/15/98. **Failure of principal to provide amended security documents shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**"

Request for Bond Release:

Subdivision No. 47-86-P

Briley Parkway Business Center, Section 2
Weeks/NWI Warehouse Group, L.P., principal

Located abutting both margins of Brick Church Lane, between Brick Church Pike and I-24.

Resolution No. 98-229

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 47-86-P, Bond No. 96BD-060, Briley Parkway Business Center, Section 2 in the amount of \$28,000."

Subdivision No. 91P-008G

Oakmont Subdivision, Phase Two
Brent A. Campbell

Located abutting the southeast terminus of Grand Oak Way and both margins of Red Feather Lane.

Resolution No. 98-230

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 91P-008G, Bond No. 94BD-057, Oakmont Subdivision, Phase 2 in the amount of \$45,000."

Subdivision No. 94P-004U

Mt. View Apartments
DMC Builders Company, Inc, principal

Located abutting the north margin of Mt. View Road, east and west of Baby Ruth Lane.

Resolution No. 98-231

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 94P-004U, Bond No. 95BD-082, Mt. View Apartments in the amount of \$29,000."

Subdivision No. 94P-014U

Williamsburg at Brentwood, Section One

Phillips Builders, Inc., principal

Located abutting the southwest corner of Cloverland Drive and Saddlewood Lane.

Resolution No. 98-232

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 94P-014U, Bond No. 95BD-109, Williamsburg at Brentwood, Section 1 in the amount of \$24,750."

MANDATORY REFERRALS:

Proposal No. 98M-032U

Alley 189 Closure
Map 105-3
Subarea 11 (1993)
District 19 (Sloss)

A proposal to close Alley 189 between Martin and Brown Streets, requested by Frank Daws for adjacent property owners. (Easements are to be retained).

Resolution No. 98-233

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 98M-032U.

Proposal No. 98M-033U

Metropolitan Government Radio Communications Tower
Map 61, Part of Parcel 26
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 4 (Majors)

A council bill authorizing the acquisition of land by the Public Property Administrator for the construction of a new radio communication tower for the Metropolitan Government.

Resolution No. 98-234

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 98M-033U.

Proposal No. 98M-035U

Sale of Property Located at 1925 16th Avenue North
Map 81-7, Parcel 209
Subarea 8 (1995)
District 20 (Haddox)

A council bill authorizing the Director of Public Property Administration to sell certain property located at 1925 16th Avenue North for a minimum of \$3,000.00.

Resolution No. 98-235

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 98M-035U.

Proposal No. 98M-040U
Conveyance of Church Street Park
Map 93-6-1, Parcel 12-15
Subarea 9 (1997)
District 19 (Sloss)

A council bill authorizing the conveyance of property, known as Church Street Park, owned by Metropolitan Development and Housing Authority to Metro Government.

Resolution No. 98-236

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 98M-040U.

OTHER BUSINESS:

3. Capital Budget Amendment to change the project description for project number 96PR002 pertaining to Grassmere Park.

Resolution No. 98-237

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it approves an amendment to the 1997-2003 Capital Improvements Budget and Program by amending the description for an existing Parks and Recreation project as follows:

FROM:

I.D. No. 96PR002
Grassmere - Infrastructure Improvements
Parking, Driveway, Landscaping
Croft House Renovation
Working Farm

TO:

I.D. No. 96PR002
Grassmere - Infrastructure Improvements
Parking, Driveway, Landscaping and Other Infrastructure Improvements
Croft House Renovation
Working Farm

This concluded the items on the consent agenda.

ZONE CHANGE PROPOSALS:

Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-049U
Map 72, Parcels 2 (2.13 acres), 23 (4.79 acres),
24 (3.9 acres) and 26 (6.78 acres)
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 4 (Majors)

A request to change from IR to OL District properties located at 2034 Pittway Drive and on the northeast margin of Oakwood Avenue, approximately 100 feet west of Ellington Parkway (17.6 acres), requested by Dale and Associates, appellant, for Mike Archbold, owner. (Deferred from meeting of 3/19/98).

Ms. Regen stated this item had been deferred from the last meeting and that the application had been amended. The original application was for IR to OG and had been amended to IR to OL. Staff has reviewed the request and are recommending disapproval of the rezoning because, despite the applicant amending their application to the lowest intensity office use that would still permit the K-12 school that they were proposing for a portion of this property, the OL District is too intense for the area, which is bounded by residential uses.

Staff is in agreement with the applicant that the property needs to be rezoned to something less intense that is compatible with the adjacent residential area. Staff is suggesting the property be rezoned residential, RS7.5, which is consistent with the zoning on surrounding properties. Staff's primary concern is that whatever zoning district is selected not exacerbate the traffic congestion and other problems. One primary problem is Pittway Drive. There is a center median running down East Trinity Lane which prevents making turns going in the opposite direction, as well as a local residential street, Oakwood Avenue, and the concern is placing a lot of traffic on that street by the development of this property at a higher intensity such as the OL uses.

Chairman Smith asked why Trinity Lane was divided by a barrier.

Mr. Owens stated it was because of the ramp system onto Ellington Parkway and the barriers were put there by Metro to prohibit turning movements.

Chairman Smith asked how someone would get into the industrial subdivision.

Mr. Owens stated it was a right in/right out only movement.

Ms. Regen stated staff had run some traffic numbers to get a comparison between the OL District and the proposed Residential District. If this site, of approximately 18 acres, were developed at the .75 FAR that would be permitted under the code, it would allow almost a half million square feet on that property and would produce approximately 4,500 trips per day on a local residential street and on Pittway Drive. That compares to approximately 1,000 trips that the residential district would generate at an RS7.5.

Chairman Smith stated that would not achieve what the owner wants because it does not allow for the proposed school.

Ms. Regen stated it would not allow for a K-12 school. The institute that would use this property has K-12 up to 22 year olds that would come to this piece of property. Right now, under the residential, they would only be able to do an elementary school because middle and high schools have to be on collector streets and major arterials. Oakwood nor Pittway drive are collector or arterial streets.

Chairman Smith stated that with the current existing situation Oakwood becomes an industrial road.

Mr. Owens stated there was that potential. The Commission has approved a subdivision for that industrial property and through that subdivision approval has prohibited driveway cuts to Oakwood in attempt to protect it.

Mr. Browning stated staff's preference would be to go to RS7.5 but acknowledged that OL may be better than the industrial.

Mr. Harbison asked if the subarea plan said anything about this area.

Mr. Owens stated the subarea plan actually acknowledged this area was zoned industrial. This is on a boundary. There is an industrial policy around this portion of Ellington and its interchange and then it goes into residential policy.

Mr. Harbison stated so the subarea plan is not saying it wants to push this area towards residential.

Mr. Owens stated that was correct but that it was acknowledging the traffic problems and the access constraints.

Mr. Manier expressed concerns regarding changing the zoning to OL and the school plans falling through and some other use going in.

Chairman Smith stated he felt any use of OL would be better than any IR use. The applicant does not want either zoning. He just wants to build a K-12 school and there is no zoning that allows that other than OL.

Ms. Warren stated she felt the OL would be better than Industrial but if the school went down the drain there could be 500,000 square foot office development.

Mr. Harbison stated that right now there could be industrial development.

Mr. Manier stated he was just trying to bring the point up to be examined and was not saying he was opposed to it but trying to keep the Commission out of a mental habit of trying to conform what is being done to the momentary desires of a particular petitioner. He suggested the OL is an improvement for the benefit of the neighborhood and probably the Commission should consider endorsing it.

Mr. Lawson asked that if the Commission did recommend the OL, would there still be any protection under the Subdivision Regulations regarding traffic and access on Oakwood.

Mr. Owens stated the Commission always had that authority under the Subdivision Regulations to address access but first it would have to come to the Commission as a subdivision plat.

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Manier seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-238

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-049U is **APPROVED (7-0)**:

The proposed OL District will provide more compatibilites with the existing single-family residential area, which abuts this property on two sides, than does the existing industrial zoning on the property (IR)."

Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-051U
Map 147-7, Parcels 194 (.11 acres), 195 (.11 acres),
196 (.25 acres) and 208 (.4 acres)

Subarea 12 (1997)
District 26 (Arriola)

A request to change from R6 to OR20 District properties located at 314, 318, and 320 Alice Avenue, approximately 400 feet east of Nolensville Pike (.87 acres), requested by Lake Providence Missionary Baptist Church, appellant/trustee.

Ms. Regen stated staff was recommending disapproval of this request. This request is by the Lake Providence Missionary Baptist Church. There is a very substandard road called Higgins Street which runs right at the back of the church and accesses some of the property and there is Alice Avenue, which is another substandard street, that also accesses the property. The basic issue is not whether to permit this church to use this lot for parking but whether or not office and multi-family residential is appropriate so far away from Nolensville Pike. There is a commercial arterial existing policy applying along the corridor and this property does not fall within that corridor. Instead it falls within the residential low-medium policy of the subarea plan. Therefore staff is recommending disapproval because staff feels placing OR20 zoning on the property is not appropriate in a residential area.

Councilmember Arriola stated she was very much in favor of this proposal. This property is a vacant lot and the church is already using it for parking and there have been any complaints regarding the usage.

Chairman Smith asked Councilmember Arriola that if she understood the church did not have to use that property for parking once it is rezoned.

Councilmember Arriola stated she did understand that but being a church they needed the parking space. They are presently parking across the street at Lowe's and anywhere else they can find and that is what they are going to use it for.

Mr. Bruce Maxwell, pastor of the church, stated he was asking to use the property for parking. The current membership is currently over 2,500 members and they are running two meetings. If this area were rezoned so the church could use it as parking space, it would serve in a more safety oriented capacity for the membership. Some members are parking on Nolensville Road. He guaranteed the Commission that if this property is rezoned it will be used for parking.

Mr. Harbison asked to be refreshed on the issue of church parking.

Mr. Owens stated the Zoning Code had been amended to allow churches to park off-site but this property would not qualify for that because it is facing a different street and there are intervening properties that the church does not own. The church does own a piece of property, however, on the west side of Nolensville Road, directly opposite the church, which is not currently being used for parking. It is vacant and that property would indeed qualify under the zoning changes the Council made last fall. Staff does not feel the church has totally exhausted all their opportunities within the current possibility of zoning to provide more parking. There is no doubt more parking is needed, but staff does not believe that going back into the heart of this residential area is the proper way to solve the problem.

Chairman Smith asked what the subarea plan said about this area.

Ms. Regen stated the subarea plan indicated this area should remain residential and that office and commercial uses should be along the commercial corridor of Nolensville Road.

Councilmember Garrett stated that if he understood right that this property was already being used and was graveled and stated that it looked like to him that this parcel and the church property touched in the corner.

Ms. Regen stated no, because this property was actually a land locked parcel.

Councilmember Garrett that the contiguous property policy was made but it was not perfect and that is why Mr. Maxwell was before the Commission. This church is helping clean up the neighborhood and maybe this should be looked at as a compromise.

Mr. Harbison stated that every church would be as sympathetic a situation as this one as far as the offsite parking issue.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Warren seconded the motion, which carried, with Councilmember Garrett in opposition, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-239

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-051U is **DISAPPROVED (6-1)**:

The property falls within the Subarea 12 Plan's Residential Low Medium (RLM) policy which does not permit office, parking or multi-family uses. The proposed OR20 District would constitute a spot zone as it is inconsistent with RLM policy and the residential zoning pattern in the area. Non-residential uses such as offices and higher density residential such as the OR20 District permits, are more appropriate along the Nolensville Pike commercial corridor."

Request for Rehearing:

Zone Change Proposal No. 98Z-046U

Map 70-8, Parcels 98 (.06 acres) and 99 (.06 acres)

Subarea 3 (1992)

District 2 (Black)

A request to change from CL to CS District property located at 2121 Gains Street, approximately 500 feet east of Free Silver Road (.12 acres), requested by James Davis, appellant/owner. (Disapproved by the Commission on 3/19/98).

Ms. Regen stated this item was a request for a rehearing because staff had failed to communicate to the Commission at the last meeting that the applicant had requested to defer this prior to the meeting.

Mr. Harbison stated the Commission should rehear this because there was a miscommunication.

Mr. Harbison moved and Ms. Warren seconded the motion, which carried unanimously to rehear Zone Change 98Z-046U.

Ms. Regen stated staff was recommending disapproval of this request. Prior to the adoption of the new Zoning Code on January 1st, this area was zoned CS. It was changed to CL in order to bring the zoning into conformance with the General Plan policies and provide for consumer shopping needs. By reintroducing CS zoning into the middle of this area, staff feels it could lead to a spotty zoning pattern and possibly not achieving the subarea plan goal for community shopping needs. The applicant is wanting to construct a small warehouse for his construction supplies and equipment which he currently stores outdoors on the property. Under the new code the CS District permits small warehouse uses but they are not permitted in the CL District. A concern may be whether this applicant was somehow adversely affected when the new code took effect. Staff has researched whether the applicant's construction business could fall under the zoning regulations as legally nonconforming uses. Under the prior code, construction sales and services limited was permitted within the CS District, provided the entire operation was within an enclosed structure, but this operation has never been since he has owned the property since 1996. The applicant has also never

had a use and occupancy permit from Codes to have that operation on the property so staff is saying he is not a legally nonconforming use.

Chairman Smith asked if this was the only parcel Mr. Davis owned in the area.

Ms. Regen stated it was not and pointed out the other properties owned by Mr. Davis and stated he did have a valid permit for that use.

Mr. Preston Quirk, representing Mr. James Davis, stated that this property was zoned CS until December 31st of last year when it was rezoned by the new Zoning Ordinance to CL. Mr. Davis purchased this property in 1996 zoned as CS with the intent to build a warehouse on it at some point in the future. In February he found out it had been rezoned to CL from CS. He has had storage on the property and it has not all been outdoor storage. There is a small 16 x 25 storage building that has been on the property since fall of 1996. There has been a small amount of warehouse use there and there have been no objections from the neighbors. He has obtained an affidavit from some of the neighbors that acknowledges the fact that he has used this for storage since that time. Mr. Davis had no knowledge of the rezoning even though there was a public hearing process, but the average person had knowledge that this property might go from CS to CL which is what happened in this situation and it made it impossible for him to build the building that he bought the land for.

Chairman Smith stated he personally had a hard time taking away somebody's use of the land from them because of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Harbison asked if the zone change happened in the mapping process.

Mr. Owens stated it did.

Mr. Harbison asked if this area had a spotty zoning pattern before or if it was all CS.

Mr. Owens stated it was all CS and CL did not exist as a zoning district until the new code became effective and the Council did hold two public hearings on the maps.

Mr. Harbison stated that as a practical matter the mapping process may not have been understood by any given property owner, but the fact that it was an illegal operation before is a negative.

Mr. Quirk stated that the storage shed was the type that many people in Nashville had in their backyards and a lot of people don't know that when you move one of those onto a piece of property that they have to have a permit. If Mr. Davis had known that he would have addressed that issue at the time.

Mr. Harbison stated that if Mr. Davis had known about the permit and known about the down zoning from CS to CL, then he may have been able to get some relief sooner.

Mr. Manier stated that down zoning in the strictest legal sense would be a diminution in value and you could never prove the difference between CL and CS. This man purchased property and assumed he could do something and that is a troubling thing.

Mr. Owens stated that where this property fell through the gap was that this property did not have a valid zoning permit when the new code went into effect for the construction sales and service and therefore, it is not a legally nonconforming use and therefore, not protected under state law.

Chairman Smith stated he thought that Mr. Davis was in the water proofing business and that what he was storing was caulking. It does not take much space to store caulking. He started his business in 1996 or whenever he moved to this property and is now growing and that is the way you get ahead in the world and it would be hard to penalize a person for his initial use.

Mr. Harbison stated that if Mr. Davis had built the building before the new zoning took effect and had a valid permit he would now be legally nonconforming.

Chairman Smith stated that what Mr. Quirk was asking the Commission to do was to consider that small storage building since that was adequate for the business.

Mr. Owens stated that was the Codes Department call. If the storage building legitimately satisfied the intent of the old zoning code as storage within a building, the Zoning Administrator would then be required to allow this new structure to be constructed and this Commission would not have to be considering a zone change.

Mr. Browning asked if the Board of Zoning Appeals considered this and made an interpretation of whether nor not the code could be interpreted.

Mr. Owens stated he was not aware that the owner had filed a Class A Appeal.

Mr. Harbison stated that is what the Commission should encourage to happen.

Mr. Lawson asked if the Commission could send a recommendation to the BZA.

Mr. Owens stated the Commission could send a recommendation to them.

Chairman Smith suggested deferring this matter and sending it to the BZA.

Mr. Lawson moved and Mr. Harbison seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to defer this matter, have the applicant talk to the Codes Department and explain the situation. If that does not result in a resolution, recommend to the applicant that he appeal to the Board of Zoning Appeals and this Commission recommend to the Board of Zoning Appeals that they act favorably upon this as a nonconforming use.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICTS:

Proposal No. 94-71-G

Bellevue Mall

Map 128, Parcels 148 and 152

Map 142, Parcels 297-301 and 318

Subarea 6 (1996)

District 23 (Crafton)

A request to revise the approved preliminary site development plan of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located abutting the north margin of Highway 70S (Memphis-Bristol Highway) and the west margin of Sawyer Brown Road (22.3 acres), classified SCR, to permit the development of an additional anchor store with an associated satellite building, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., for Bellevue Properties, L.L.C., owners. (Deferred from meeting of 3/19/98).

Mr. Delaney said staff was recommending disapproval of this proposal to permit the addition of a fifth anchor tenant which would be in a proposed associated satellite building of 11,700 square feet which is identified as an auto repair and tire changing facility. Staff is in support of the building and use but not in support of the proposed location of the facility on the edge of the mall property. Staff feels this building should be attached to the main mall building because of concerns regarding the residential area across Sawyer Brown Road which may be compromised.

Mr. Scott Haynes, representing mall manager Mr. Jim Romer, stated that Councilmembers Crafton and Lineweaver were in favor of this proposal. This use is permitted as originally approved in the PUD and will not effect the other side of Sawyer Brown Road.

Mr. Bill Lockwood explained the configuration buffering of the new satellite building.

Mr. Harbison ask if there were concerns such as noise, traffic impact or anything other than the visual concern.

Mr. Owens stated the only concerns were the visual and precedent setting concerns.

Mr. Harbison stated it seemed that he was hearing this may be the most economically viable way to enhance that regional activity center.

Mr. Manier asked what degree of notification was given to any interested parties.

Mr. Owens stated there was no notification.

Mr. Manier stated he had not received any negative reaction or any location reaction.

Mr. Lockwood stated it had been in the paper three or four times.

Councilmember Garrett stated he could assure the Commission that in the Bellevue community they would have heard from them if there was opposition.

Mr. Haynes stated these terms were agreed to with the condo association at the beginning of the PUD process on the original plans.

Mr. Manier moved and Councilmember Garrett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-240

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 94-71-G is given **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF A REVISION TO PRELIMINARY (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of preliminary approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. With any final approval request that includes the satellite building, the applicant has agreed to fully screen the building with additional landscaping on top of the existing berm, to screen any mechanical systems from view and to prohibit the placement of any signage on the east facing side of the building.”

Proposal No. 97P-035U

Ashley Park
Map 161, Parcels 120, 139, 238 and Part of Parcel 66
Map 161-14, Parcel 20
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 32 (Jenkins)

A request for final approval for the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the north margin of Old Hickory Boulevard, approximately 700 feet east of Thribble Springs Drive (5.6 acres), classified R10 and R20, to permit the development of 14 single-family lots, requested by MEC, Inc., for Brent Sellers, owner.

Mr. Delaney stated staff was recommending approval of this proposal but it is in need of a variance to the Subdivision Regulations. As part of this development there is a main road that accesses the Christ

Pentecostal Church property to the back. Part of this proposal is to allow the church access through this property during peak hour traffic demands as a secondary ingress and egress. The Commission actually disapproved this proposal on preliminary and it was approved by Council. The road has been put as far west as possible on the property and there is a road that exists on the adjacent PUD. The distance between those two roads is approximately 280 feet. The Subdivision Regulations require a minimum of 300 feet of separation between two streets. This issue was identified on the preliminary level and both planning staff and traffic and parking engineers feel a variance to the regulations is appropriate.

Mr. Lawson moved and Mr. Harbison seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-241

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 97P-035U is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-6.2.1 H (2), STREET DESIGN STANDARDS, OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS (7-0)**. The following condition applies:

Written confirmation of final approval from the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

SUBDIVISIONS:

Preliminary Plats:

Subdivision No. 98S-046G (*Public Hearing*)
Sequoia Village Subdivision
Map 43-1, Parcels 85, 87, 96, 107, 108, 109 and
Part of Parcel 143
Subarea 4 (1993)
District 9 (Dillard)

A request for preliminary approval for 58 lots abutting the northeast corner of Shannon Avenue and Pierce Road (14.55 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Charles Rhoten, owner/developer, Burns Consulting, surveyor.

Ms. Carrington stated staff was recommending deferring this matter until the April 16th agenda to work out design issues with the applicant. Councilmember Dillard is also requesting deferral.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

Mr. Lawson moved and Ms. Warren seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to defer this matter for two weeks and leave the public hearing open.

Final Plats:

Subdivision No. 98S-009U
MetroCenter, Tract 7L
Map 70-16, Part of Parcel 2
Subarea 8 (1995)
District 20 (Haddox)

A request to create one lot abutting the southwest margin of Venture Circle (private), approximately 190 feet northeast of French Landing Drive (1.77 acres), classified within the IWD District, requested by MetroCenter Holdings, Inc., owner/developer, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., surveyor.

Ms. Carrington stated that in this case the Commission will need to make a determination whether the previous plat approvals in this area justify granting a variance to the Subdivision Regulations of the requirement that all lots must have public street frontage. The lot is located on Venture Circle, which a private access easement. The plat was approved in the 1970's for the entire area that had the public roadway dedications on it and since that time there have been six individual one lot plats approved with their only access being on this private access easement. In 1991 the Subdivision Regulations were amended. Prior to that time it was legal to plat a commercial or industrial lot on a private easement. Since that time all lots must be on public streets unless they are in a PUD. This property is industrially zoned and is right now part of a larger parcel that does have access on French Landing, which is a public street. However, because Venture Circle bisects the property, it is unlikely there will ever be a unified development on it. The applicant has investigated the possibility of dedicating Venture Circle to Metro as a public street; however, it has inadequate width and pavement thickness and Metro is not interested in it as a public street. He feels the only viable option is to get a variance to the public street frontage requirement.

Mr. Harold Fulghum stated MetroCenter started back in the early 1970's. A large lot subdivision was set up and small lots were also created with a private road and said he would let Randy Parham bring the Commission up to date on where things are now.

Mr. Randy Parham, president of MetroCenter Holdings, stated Venture Circle is a private road and was specifically design for MetroCenter to be able to accommodate smaller lot users. The Venture Circle road does exist as a private easement and there is a deed restriction that exists on all of the properties that access it where there is a common obligation to maintain Venture Circle. To keep the integrity of the way this was master planned to begin with, it was looked at to be dedicated as a Metro public street. It apparently met the Metro street criteria back in the 1970's when it was built. There was an indication the city might accept the road as a one way street; however, the group of owners decided they would rather continue to maintain the road as a private street and keep it two way.

Mr. Manier moved and Mr. Lawson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-242

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-009U, is **APPROVED WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-4.2A. SUBJECT TO POSTING A BOND OF \$3,000.00 (7-0).”**

Subdivision No. 98S-106A

Montgomery Place, Section 2, Lot 14
Map 160-16-A, Parcel 23
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 32 (Jenkins)

A request to amend the rear setback line from 20 feet to 8.5 feet on a lot abutting the east margin of Chadwick Lane, approximately 452 feet southeast of McGuire Court (.21 acres), classified within the R20 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Charles R. and Fran C. Johnston, III, owners/developers.

Ms. Carrington stated staff was recommending disapproval of this request to reduce the platted rear setback from 20 feet to 8.5 feet. She showed the plan that was approved with the building permit for the house which did comply with the building envelope, but then a deck was added which now encroaches into the setback. The Zoning Regulations allow decks to encroach up to 10 feet from the property and this one is

8.5 feet. Staff sees no compelling hardship of the property that would justify reducing the setback and are recommending disapproval.

Mr. Trae Adkisson, with Radnor Homes, stated they did own the pond that is bordering this property and there would no other homes directly behind this home. They have received approval from the homeowners association and from the two adjacent neighbors.

Mr. Lawson moved and Ms. Nielson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-243

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-106A, is **DISAPPROVED (7-0).”**

Request for Bond Extension:

Subdivision No. 93P-008G
Chandler Grove
Brent A. Campbell, co-principal
Charles V. Duncan, co-principal

Located abutting the south margin of Chandler Road, approximately 2,410 feet east of Tulip Grove Road.

Ms. Carrington stated staff was recommending approval of the extension of the performance bond. This would normally be a item on the consent agenda but staff has heard from the homeowners association and they have had a few problems with sidewalks, curbs and street signs and they wanted the Commission to be aware. Public Works is also aware of the problems and have assured staff these can be addressed by May 15, 1998, and are working with the applicant and they also support extension of the bond.

Mr. Lawson moved and Ms. Nielson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-244

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for extension of a performance bond for Subdivision No. 93P-008G, Bond No. 94BD-082, Chandler Grove, in the amount of \$35,000 to 5/15/98 subject to submittal of an amendment to the present Letter of Credit by **4/15/98** which extends its expiration date to 11/15/98. **Failure of principal to provide amended security documents shall be grounds for collection without further notification.”**

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. FY '99 Work Program and Budget.

Mr. Browning explained the Work Program and Budget and stated it would be presented to the Mayor in April with the Commission's approval.

Mr. Lawson moved and Ms. Nielson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the FY '99 Work Program and Budget.

2. Employee Contract for Debbie Frank.

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Lawson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-245

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it approve the employment contract for Debbie Frank for one year.

4. Projects recommended for inclusion in the 1998-99 to 2003-04 Capital Improvements Budget and Program.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Warren seconded the motion, which carried unanimously to approve the following resolution:

Resolution No. 98-246

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it approves the 1998-99 to 2003-04 Capital Improvements Budget and Program.

5. Historic Preservation Functional Plan presentation.

Mr. Calleja stated that as the Commission is aware, the Advance Planning and Research Division, as part of this years work program is to complete three Functional Plans (Transportation, Economic Development and Historic Preservation) by the end of this fiscal year (June).

The Commission has all ready heard introductory presentations on the Transportation and Economic Development. Historic Preservation is the last of the three.

In this presentation I hope to accomplish two things:

1. Establish the Role of the Planning Commission in Historic Preservation
2. Establish the Role of the Functional Plan in guiding Nashville/Davidson County’s preservation efforts for the next 20 years.

Concept 2010 provides us with the long range goals and policies for the preservation of Nashville’s Heritage.

One of the objectives is the development of a database of historic sites. The Metropolitan Historical Commission has been working on a data base for the last 12 years.

Last summer staff started encoding the data as part of the GIS system. The database contains close to 10 thousand sites and is to be completed as part of the functional plan.

Another objective is to establish a coordinated effort between Metro departments concerning Historic Preservation. Coordination among agencies has been an issue in the past and is still an issue today. The MPC, Codes, MDHA and MHC all have differing priorities and missions that are sometimes contradictory.

An example is the differing policies on when a residential structure should be demolished. Codes currently uses a standard that if the cost to repair exceeds 50% of the value of the structure then it should be

demolished. The Historic Commission wants a standard of 75% to 80% used when dealing with historic structures. In the development of the Historic Functional Plan this should be addressed. Should it be either one (50% or 75%) or maybe a third option like reconstruction or demolish shall be based on whether it is more cost effective to start over or rebuild when dealing specifically with historic structures.

Another objective is to encourage the preservation and/or reuse of historic structures and areas. An example is the terminus of Natchez Trace which has been an issue before the Planning Commission that is yet not totally resolved.

Subarea 6 Future Land Use Policy designates Natchez Trace right of way as MPO (Major Public Open Space). Surrounding the Trace the land use policy is natural conservation and Residential Low Medium density. Zoning surrounding the Trace is AR2A, RS 40, RS 30 and CL. With the development of the Trace, the MPC staff and the Historic Commission worked on coming up with a way to protect the integrity and historic nature of the Trace. All parties agreed that the area around Natchez Trace should be maintained in a rural setting in keeping with the Trace's historic character. When MPC staff talked to the Historic Commission concerning how can we preserve the integrity and historic nature of the Trace, the Historic Commission indicated that they had no mechanism they could assist our endeavors because the area did not contain a historic structure. Historic Zoning requires the preservation of structure not area.

Therefore, at the present time no protection is afforded the terminus of the Trace besides the use of the natural conservation land use policy and large lot zoning districts whose main intent is to protect natural resources and is a holding category for future intensification. It does not address the scenic and historic nature of the Trace. Further, with the southwest side of Davidson County one of the most rapidly developing areas especially along State Road 100, development pressures around the Trace will continue to increase. The Planning Commission will need to make some decisions with regard to how the area around the Trace should develop. The Historic Functional Plan is the document that should lay out Metro's position on the area and set some detailed policies toward future development around the Trace. Policies to be considered may include the use of a design overlay district and / or transfer of development rights as tools to reach everyone's goal of maintaining a rural character around the terminus of the Trace.

The last objective to be discussed in this presentation is to set policy for archeological sites for Metro. Metropolitan Davidson County's Long Range Plan does not establish what its position is concerning the findings of archeological sites and what its position is towards either retaining them or having them removed.

Concept 2010 goals indicates that archeological sites should be promoted. The Planning Commission needs to make a determination on how the goal is to be applied. Maybe policies should be that within the Urban Area where development is to occur that the removal of archeological sites is the preference, but that in the rural area these sites should be retained -- or an area set aside specifically for the relocation of artifacts.

The former highlights only some of the issues that need to be addressed as part of the Historic Preservation Plan. Many other issues will be evaluated and recommendations made as part of our research.

Mr. Calleja discussed the outline for the development of the Historic Functional Plan.

I. Introduction

II. History of Nashville's Development

III. Inventory of Buildings, Sites and Areas of Historical Significance

IV. Methods of Historic Preservation

V. Implementation of Historic Preservation

PLATS PROCESSED ADMINISTRATIVELY

March 19 through April 1, 1998

- 98S-032U** **EDMONDSON CROSSING SHOPPING CENTER**
One lot into two lots
- 98S-095U** **FAIRFIELD NASHVILLE at MUSIC CITY USA,**
Phase 2, Building 13
Condominium plat
- 98S-076U** **SIDCO, Section 5, Resubdivision**
Reconfigures one platted lot by adding a portion of a deeded parcel
- 98S-104U** **JOHNSON-EWING PROPERTY**
Reconfigures interior line between two platted lots

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, upon motion made, seconded and passed, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

Minute Approval:
This 16th day of April, 1998