

MINUTES
OF THE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: July 20, 2000
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Place: Howard Auditorium

Roll Call

Present:

James Lawson, Chairman
Tonya Jones
William Manier
Ann Nielson
Vicki Oglesby
Councilmember Phil Ponder
Douglas Small
Marilyn Warren

Absent:

Mayor Bill Purcell
Frank Cochran

Executive Office:

Richard C. Bernhardt, Executive Director
Karen P. Nicely, Assistant Executive Director
Carolyn Perry, Secretary III

Current Planning & Design Division:

Theresa Carrington, Planning Division Manager
Jennifer Regen, Planner III
John Reid, Planner II
Jeff Stuncard, Planner I
Andrew Wall, Planning Technician I

Community Plans Division:

Jerry Fawcett, Planning Division Manager
Cynthia Wood, Planner III

Advance Planning & Research:

Ryan Latimer, Planning Technician I

Others Present:

Jim Armstrong, Public Works
David Diza-Barriga, Legal Department

Chairman Lawson called the meeting to order.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Carrington announced the following changes to the agenda:

2000S-217U-14 – should be 2000S217G-14.
2000Z-091G-14 – Map 108, Parcel 45 has been deleted.
88P-031U-03 – has been withdrawn.
Add – Addendum, Employee Contract for Michelle Kubant.
Add – Addendum, 2000Z-022T Neighborhood Landmark District.
Zoning items 2000Z-021T, 2000Z-94U-06, 2000Z-49U-05 and 2000Z-022T will be taken out of order.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which unanimously passed, to adopt the agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEFERRED ITEMS

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

2000S-217G-14 Deferred indefinitely, by applicant.
2000Z-224G-10 Deferred indefinitely, by applicant.
2000S-230G-04 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.
2000S-232G-01 Deferred indefinitely, by applicant.
2000S-235U-07 Deferred indefinitely, by applicant.
2000Z-091G-14 Deferred two meetings, by applicant.
175-75-G-06 Deferred indefinitely, by applicant.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Oglesby moved and Ms. Nielson seconded the motion, which unanimously passed to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of July 6, 2000.

RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

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

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

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

SUBDIVISION PROPOSALS

98S-128G-14

Rockwood Estates
Map 86, Parcel 102
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 12 (Ponder)

A request for final plat approval to create 26 lots approximately 65 feet north of Rockwood Drive and approximately 450 feet northwest of Tulip Grove Road (5.93 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Universal Builders, owner/developer, MEC, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-587

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 98S-128G-14, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$249,000.00 (7-0).”**

99S-049G-14

Golf Club Place, First Revision (formerly
Albatross at Old Hickory, Phase 1)
Map 53-11-A, Parcels 1-4 and 7-11
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 11 (Brown)

A request for final plat approval to revise the rear lot lines on three lots and revise common area to open space, abutting the east margin of Hurst Drive, approximately 3,000 feet southeast of Ryburn Drive (11.29 acres), classified within the R15 District, requested by Jerry Lemons, owner/developer, Steve Sanders, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-588

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 99S-049G-14, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

99S-422U-08

McKissack School Subdivision
Map 92-5, Parcels 33, 34, 39 and 42
Subarea 8 (1995)
District 21 (Whitmore)

A request for final plat approval to consolidate 18 lots and two parcels into two lots abutting the west margin of 38th Avenue North, between Clare Avenue and Batavia Street (18.7 acres), classified within the R6 District, requested by Davidson County Board of Education, owner/developer, Volunteer Surveying, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-589

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 99S-422U-08, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

2000S-065G-12

Banbury Estates
Map 172, Parcel 120

Subarea 12 (1997)
District 32 (Jenkins)

A request for final plat approval to create nine lots abutting the north terminus of Turnberry Point, approximately 130 feet north of Banbury Station (5.05 acres), classified within the RS20 District, requested by Jones Company, owner/developer, Gresham, Smith and Partners, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-590

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-065G-12, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$186,000.00 (7-0).”**

2000S-202U-07
West Meade Farms, Inc., Section 9,
Resubdivision of Lot 817
Map 115-13, Parcel 12
Subarea 7 (2000)
District 23 (Bogen)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into two lots abutting the south margin of Grayson Drive, approximately 1,310 feet northwest of Jocelyn Hollow Road (5.19 acres), classified within the RS40 District, requested by Ronald Bickness and Doyle Newbury, owners/developer, Thornton and Associates, Inc., surveyor. (Deferred from meetings of 6/22/00 and 7/6/00).

Resolution No. 2000-591

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-202U-07, is **APPROVED WITH VARIANCES TO SECTIONS 2-4.2D AND 2-4.2E OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS (7-0).”**

2000S-207G-06
The Marketplace
Map 102, Parcels 80-87
Subarea 6 (1996)
District 23 (Bogen)

A request for final plat approval to record eight parcels as eight lots abutting the north margin of Charlotte Pike at River Road, opposite Davidson Drive (65.11 acres), classified within the CS District, requested by JDN Development Corporation, owner/developer, Geosurvey, Ltd., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-592

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-207G-06, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

2000S-209G-04
Shannon Place, Section 3
Map 43-1, Parcels 74-77
Subarea 4 (1998)
District 9 (Dillard)

A request for final plat approval to create six lots abutting the west margin of Palmer Avenue, opposite Sylvia Avenue (1.1 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Charles E. and Carole Rhoten, owner/developer, Burns and Associates, Inc., surveyor. (Deferred from meeting of 7/6/00).

Resolution No. 2000-593

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-209G-04, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$22,000.00 (7-0).”**

2000S-228G-12
Sugar Valley, Section 5
Map 181, Part of Parcel 20
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 31 (Knoch)

A request for final plat approval to create 45 lots abutting the east terminus of Sugarplum Road, approximately 670 feet east of Sugarloaf Drive (12.1 acres), classified within the R20 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Hurley-Y L.P., owner/developer, Anderson-Delk & Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-594

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-228G-12, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$471,000.00 (7-0).”**

2000S-229U-13
Cambridge Forest, Section 4
Map 149, Parcel 319
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 28 (Alexander)

A request for final plat approval to create 36 lots abutting the northeast terminus of Welshcrest Drive, approximately 110 feet northeast of Edencrest Drive (12.04 acres), classified within the R15 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Double M Partners, owner/developer, Anderson-Delk and Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-595

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-229U-13, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$172,000.00 (7-0).”**

2000S-234U-13
The Crossings at Hickory Hollow, Phase 2,
Resubdivision of Lot 2
Map 174, Parcel 176
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 28 (Alexander)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into three lots abutting the southwest margin of Crossings Boulevard, opposite Crossing Circle (34.91 acres), classified within the R10 Commercial Planned Unit Development District, requested by TSC Realty Capital, L.P., owner/developer, Gresham, Smith and Partners, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-596

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-234U-13, a request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into three lots abutting the southwest margin of

Crossings Boulevard, opposite Crossing Circle (34.91 acres), classified within the R10 Commercial Planned Unit Development District, requested by TSC Realty Capital, L.P., owner/developer, Gresham, Smith and Partners, surveyor, is **APPROVED (7-0).**”

ZONE CHANGE AND PUD PROPOSALS

41-66-U-13

Haywood Development Shopping Center (Walgreens)
Map 148, Parcel 176
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 28 (Alexander)

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located abutting the northwest corner of Haywood Lane and Antioch Pike, classified CL (3.68 acres), to develop a 14,490 square foot retail drug store and to renovate a 10,061 square foot retail building, replacing a portion of the existing 38,000 square foot retail building, requested by Littlejohn Engineering Associates, for Paul W. Williams, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-597

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 41-66-U-13 is given **APPROVAL TO REVISE A PORTION OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PORTION (7-0).** The following conditions apply:

1. Submittal of revised plans to the staff of the Metropolitan Planning Commission by July 27, 2000 which includes additional right-of-way along a portion of Antioch Pike to permit the construction of a dedicated right turn lane, as required by the Metropolitan Traffic Engineer.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a revised final plat shall be recorded including the dedication of 10 feet of right-of-way along the west side of Haywood Lane and any necessary right-of-way dedication along Antioch Pike for a right-turn lane from Antioch Pike onto Haywood Lane.
3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

74-79-G-13

Nashboro Village, Tract 18, Phase II
Map 135, Part of Parcel 322
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 27 (Sontany)

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a phase of the Residential Planned Unit Development District located abutting the eastern terminus of Longhunter Court, north of Nashboro Boulevard, classified RM6 (5.46 acres), to develop 48 condominium units, replacing 61 condominium units, requested by Wamble and Associates, for Vasland Nashboro Development LLC, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-598

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 74-79-G-13 is given **APPROVAL TO REVISE A PORTION OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL OF A PHASE (7-0).** The following conditions apply:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a final subdivision plat shall be recorded, including all necessary bonds for public improvements.”

108-79-G-04

Hickory Hills Ridge (Formerly Graycroft Manor), Phase 1A
 Map 40, Parcels 14, 19 and 29
 Subarea 4 (1998)
 District 3 (Nollner)

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for Phase 1 of the Residential Planned Unit Development District located abutting the east margin of I-65, south of Nesbitt Lane, classified R10 (31.88 acres), to reconfigure 78 single-family lots on the preliminary plan and for final approval for 9 single-family lots in Phase 1, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, for Jerry Harlan, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-599

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 108-79-G-04 is given **APPROVAL OF A REVISION TO THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAN FOR PHASE 1A (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of final approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the metropolitan Department of Public Works
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a final subdivision plat shall be recorded including all necessary bonds for public improvements.
3. Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits for lots 6 thru 78, a critical lot plan shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for review and approval. 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.”

62-85-P-12

Brentwood Highlands
 Map 172, Parcel 79
 Subarea 12 (1997)
 District 31 (Knoch)

A request to cancel an undeveloped portion and amend a portion of the Residential Planned Unit Development District located abutting the west margin of Nolensville Pike, north of Brentwood Highlands Drive, classified R10 (27.67 acres), to cancel the undeveloped northern portion of the PUD approved for 396 multi-family units, requested by William L. Dudley of BEAC, Inc., for Lake Providence Miss. Baptist Church, owner, and Jerrold L. Smith.

Resolution No. 2000-600

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 62-85-P-12 is given **APPROVAL TO AMEND THE PUD AND TO CANCEL THE UNDEVELOPED PORTION APPROVED FOR 396 MULTI-FAMILY UNITS (7-0)**. The following condition applies:

Approval of the PUD cancellation by the Metropolitan Council.”

78-86-P-12
Southmark PUD
Map 161, Part of Parcel 97
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 31 (Knoch)

A request to cancel an undeveloped portion and amend a portion of the Residential/Commercial Planned Unit Development District located abutting the west margin of Nolensville Pike, 500 feet north of Brentwood Highlands Drive, classified SCN (8.27 acres), to cancel a portion of the commercial part of the PUD approved for 52,000 square feet of office uses, 78,000 square feet of retail uses, and a 2,500 square foot restaurant, requested by William L. Dudley of BEAC, Inc., for Lake Providence Miss. Baptist Church, Inc., owner, and Jerrold L. Smith.

Resolution No. 2000-601

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 78-86-P-12 is given **APPROVAL TO CANCEL A PORTION OF THE COMMERCIAL PART OF THE PUD, APPROVED FOR 52,000 SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE USES, 78,000 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL USES, AND A 2,500 SQUARE FOOT RESTAURANT (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Approval of the PUD cancellation by the Metropolitan Council.
2. This proposal does not cancel the portion of the PUD where the 50-foot wide access easement to parcel 272 is located.”

2000P-007G-02
Greene View Estates
Map 7, Parcel 47
Subarea 2 (1995)
District 10 (Balthrop)

A request for preliminary approval for a new Planned Unit Development District located abutting the northwest corner of Springfield Highway and Tinnin Road, classified RS20 (21.71 acres), to permit 30 single-family lots, requested by Hart Freeland and Roberts Engineers, for Arles Greene, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-602

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 2000P-007G-02 is given **CONDITIONAL PRELIMINARY APPROVAL (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Approval of the PUD by the Metropolitan Council.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, confirmation of preliminary approval of this proposal shall be forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Stormwater Management and the Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
1. Prior to or in conjunction with the submittal of any final PUD plans to the Metro Planning Commission, a boundary plat shall be recorded.

4. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a final subdivision plat shall be recorded and bonds shall be posted for any necessary public improvements.”

MANDATORY REFERRALS

2000M-068U-10
SunCom Sign Encroachment
Map 104-2, Parcel 326
Subarea 10 (1994)
District 21 (Whitmore)

A request to install one sign for SunCom measuring 4' wide by 4.5' high and encroaching over the public sidewalk approximately 6 feet at a height of 8'3" above the sidewalk at 2926 West End Avenue, requested by J. Pitt of Victory Sign Industries, Ltd., for SunCom, lessee and G. Edward Cooke et ux, owners.

Resolution No. 2000-603

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-068U-10."

2000M-069U-07
Cornerstone Self-Storage Encroachment
Map 91-13, Parcel 315
Subarea 7 (2000)
District 24 (Summers)

A request to permit an existing retaining wall to encroach 2.55 feet into the right-of-way of Balmy Avenue for a length of 142 feet and at a height of approximately 5 feet, requested by Fred Sans for Charlotte Mini L.P. (dba Cornerstone Self-Storage).

Resolution No. 2000-604

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-069U-07."

2000M-070U-03
Council Bill BL2000-334
Price Street Property Sale
Map 70-8, Parcels 142, 143, 144 and 145
Subarea 3 (1998)
District 2 (Black)

A request to sell four properties located on Price Street (unnumbered), an unimproved street north of Trinity Lane, classified within the CL District (2.4 acres), requested by the Public Property Administrator, for Metro Government, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-605

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-070U-03."

2000M-071U-07
Portion of Redmon Street Closure
Map 104-1, Parcels 140.03, 145.02 and 169
Subarea 7 (2000)
District 24 (Summers)

A request to close a portion of Redmon Street where a corner of an existing building lies over the right-of-way, located east of 37th Avenue North, requested by Phillip Holmes of Volunteer Surveying, for Robert E. Clement, abutting property owner. (Easements are to be retained).

Resolution No. 2000-606

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-071U-07."

2000M-072U-07
Redmon Street Drainage/Utility Easement Abandonment
Map 104-01, Parcels 140.03, 169 and 438
Subarea 7 (2000)
District 24 (Summers)

A request to abandon a portion of a 20 foot public utility and drainage easement located at the eastern terminus of Redmon Street, east of 37th Avenue North, classified within the IWD District (.40 acres), requested by Phillip E. Holmes Jr. of Volunteer Surveying, appellant, for Robert E. Clement, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-607

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-072U-07."

2000M-073U-14
Briley Parkway Easement Acquisition II
Map 62-1, Parcel 3
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 15 (Loring)

A request to acquire an easement on a portion of property in order to relocate a 10" water main at Miami Avenue to Pennington Bend Road above Briley Parkway, which will accommodate the widening of Briley Parkway as required by the State of Tennessee, classified within the R15 District (.85 acres), requested by the Department of Water Services.

Resolution No. 2000-608

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-073U-14."

2000M-074G-01
Joelton Water Storage Reservoir Easement Acquisition
Map 22, Parcel 3
Subarea 1 (1997)
District 1 (Gilmore)

A request to acquire an easement on a portion of property to accommodate the Joelton Water Storage Reservoir located at 3612 Old Clarksville Pike, classified within the R40 District (3.7 acres), requested by the Department of Water Services.

Resolution No. 2000-609

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-074G-01."

OTHER BUSINESS

ADDENDUM

4. Employee Contract for Michelle Kubant.

Resolution No. 2000-610

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning that it **APPROVES** the employee contract for Michelle Kubant for one year, from August 1, 2000 through July 31, 2001.

This concluded the items on the consent agenda.

Councilmember Ponder arrived at 1:10, at this point in the agenda

SUBDIVISION PROPOSALS

97S-243G-02 (Public Hearing)
G. Gilbert Lowe Subdivision, Reserve Parcel A
Map 41-7, Parcel 105
Subarea 2 (1995)
District 3 (Nollner)

A request for preliminary approval to subdivide a reserve parcel into two lots abutting the north margin of Marydale Drive, opposite Hickory Terrace (1.09 acres), classified within the RS20 District, requested by Willie May Broadwell and Frances E. Bandy, owners/developers, Land Surveying, Inc., surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard stated staff is recommending approval. This plan was preliminary approved by the Commission July 10, 1997, but that plan has expired, because sewer was not available at this site. Sewer is now approved by Water Services to be extended and bonded.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

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

Resolution No. 2000-611

"**BE IT RESOLVED** by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 97S-243G-02, is **APPROVED; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (8-0).**"

ZONE CHANGE AND PUD PROPOSALS

2000Z-025U-05

Council Bill BL2000-213
Map 82-16, Parcels 43 (.19 acres) and 44 (.19 acres)
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 6 (Beehan)

A council bill to change from OR20 to CS district properties at 617 and 619 Woodland Street, approximately 240 feet west of South 7th Street (.38 acres), requested by Walter R. Owens, appellant/owner.

Ms. Regen stated the Commission looked at this zone change in March of this year. There are two properties being requested to go from OR20 to CS. One of the properties is currently a dental office and the other one is being marketed as commercial. The Subarea 5 Plan calls for the CAE policy that applies in this area, but it says, along Woodland, heavy commercial should be focused on Main Street or north at Five Points, and that is consistent with the R/UDAT Plan.

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

Resolution No. 2000-612

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-025U-05 is **DISAPPROVED (8-0)**:

These properties fall within the Subarea 5 Plan's Commercial Arterial Existing (CAE) policy calling for the revitalization of Main Street and the Five Points area by concentrating retail development within existing vacant commercial buildings and lots along Main Street and at the Five Points intersection to the east. Expanding CS zoning to Woodland Street is not consistent with that policy since it would marginalize existing underutilized commercial properties along Main Street."

2000Z-085G-02
Map 41, Parcels 61 (17.81 acres) and 63 (22.51 acres)
Subarea 2 (1995)
District 3 (Nollner)

A request to change from RS20 to RS15 district properties at Old Hickory Boulevard (unnumbered), approximately 560 feet east of Dalemere Drive (40.32 acres), requested by Jim Fischer, appellant, for J & L Land Company, LLC, owners.

Mr. Reid stated staff is recommending disapproval because it is not consistent with the residential low policy in the area. Staff did an analysis of the lot sizes in this area and to the north, south and east they average 40,000 square feet but the area just east average 26,000. In both cases the existing RS20 is more closely matched to the lot sizes of the surrounding area and is also consistent with the residential low policy.

Councilmember Ponder asked what the reason was to reduce this property to RS15.

Mr. Reid stated the applicant wanted to use the Cluster Lot option in the Zoning Code to get additional lots. They were previously approved for 69 lots and they want 96 lots.

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

Resolution No. 2000-613

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-085G-02 is **DISAPPROVED (8-0)**:

These properties fall within the Subarea 2 Plan's Residential Low (RL) policy calling for a maximum of 2 units per acre. The RS15 district is not consistent with that policy. The RS20 district is the preferred zoning district since it is consistent with both the policy and the zoning of the surrounding neighborhood."

2000Z-086U-07
Map 91-6, Parcel 17
Subarea 7 (2000)
District 22 (Hand)

A request to change from R6 to CN district property at 6006 Morrow Road, approximately 145 feet west of 60th Avenue North (.17 acres), requested by Danny Moore, appellant, for Danny R. Moore and Helena C. Clarke, owners.

Mr. Reid stated staff is recommending disapproval of this request because the CN district is not consistent with the residential policy. The subarea plan specifically mentions that any changes in this area should be towards the betterment of the neighborhood, and in addition, the commercial zoning would consume another affordable housing opportunity.

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

Resolution No. 2000-614

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-086U-07 is **DISAPPROVED (8-0)**:

This property falls within the Subarea 7 Plan's Residential Medium (RM) policy calling for protection of the residential neighborhood at 4 to 9 units per acre. This request would extend nonresidential zoning too far into this residential neighborhood and would consume an affordable housing opportunity on this property. Additionally, there are other vacant commercially zoned properties in the vicinity."

2000Z-088G-14
Map 85, Parcel 23
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 12 (Ponder)

A request to change from AR2a to IR district property at 3000 Brandau Road, abutting the east margin of the Stones River (19.5 acres), requested by Odell Binkley, appellant, for Jones Brothers Construction Company, owner.

Ms. Regen stated staff is recommending approval. Access to the property is through an easement from Brandau Road. All the property between the river, the railroad tracks and over to the road is all industrial, and is consistent with the subarea plan.

Mr. Manier asked how far below the floodplain is this piece of property.

Ms. Regen stated she did not know, but that they would be required to do the standard 50 foot buffer from Stone's River.

Mr. Jim Armstrong stated they would have to cut and fill balance. They can move dirt around on the site, but would have to keep the floodplain volume the same so that limits how much of that property they would be able to develop.

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

Resolution No. 2000-615

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-088G-14 is **APPROVED (8-0)**:

This property falls within the Subarea 14 Plan's Industrial (IND) policy calling for manufacturing, warehousing, and distribution uses. The IR district is consistent with this policy and the adjacent industrial zoning pattern to the north and east."

2000Z-089U-13
Map 163, Parcel 377
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 28 (Alexander)

A request to change from RM20 to CS district property at Hickory Hollow Parkway (unnumbered), approximately 2,100 feet west of Bell Road (2.48 acres), requested by Randy Caldwell of Ragan-Smith Associates, appellant, for Vastland/Eatherly/McClung Development LLC, owner.

Ms. Regen stated this applicant is asking for a two weeks deferral on this item.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Warren seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to defer this item for two weeks.

154-79-U-07
Lion's Head Village West
Map 103-14, Part of Parcel 115
Subarea 7 (1994)
District 24 (Summers)

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a portion of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District located abutting the north margin of White Bridge Pike, opposite Brookwood Terrace, classified SCC (.03 acres), to add five permanent trailers measuring eight and a half feet wide and 40 feet long for a total of 1,700 square feet, in the parking area west and east of the existing Target store, requested by Jeff Brockett, for Dayton-Hudson Corporation, owner.

Ms. Regen stated Target is asking to add permanent storage trailers located in their parking lot. This may set a precedent in commercial districts and outdoor storage is not allowed. There are 17,000 square feet of unused space that could be built on. Staff is recommending disapproval.

Chairman Lawson stated each Commissioner had a letter from Councilmember John Summers in opposition to permanent use of the trailers.

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

Resolution No. 2000-616

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 154-79-U-07 is given **DISAPPROVAL (8-0)**:

Permanent trailers are not permitted in commercial zoning districts. These trailers are proposed where there are approved parking spaces. Outdoor storage is not a permitted use in shopping centers and other commercial zoning districts.”

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Subarea 12 Plan Amendment Consideration

The area in question is the south side of Old Hickory Boulevard near I-65, which has been an area of considerable controversy. Staff is recommending that a public hearing be set for further consideration of this request.

Ms. Wood stated staff received the request to amend the Subarea 12 Plan: 1996 Update from Tom Jackson & Associates, Inc., on behalf of Burton & Brandt Development LLC. The applicant also filed a zone change application from R40 to RM9 (2000Z-090U-12) that they deferred from this agenda. The request is to amend the land use policy for their properties from Residential Low-Medium Density (area 3E), which supports residential development at densities of two to four units per acre, to Residential Medium Density, which supports residential development at densities of four to nine units per acre.

Staff believes that the request merits further consideration through a public hearing process, and that a larger area should be analyzed for amendment. We recommend including all of the south side of Old Hickory Boulevard between the Fredericksburg development and Oakes Drive, since the entire area is affected by the same factors. Furthermore, a zone change request (2000Z-092U-12) and a PUD proposal (2000P-006U-12) have been filed for a medium density residential development adjacent to Oakes Drive. These were also deferred from this agenda. In addition, staff has received a letter from Chance Allen & Associates, representatives of property owners who own parcels between Valley View Road and Cloverland Drive, requesting that those parcels also be included in the amendment analysis. The area we plan to look at contains about 20 acres of land, which could contain up to about 80 dwelling units under the current policy and 180 under the medium density policy. Right now, there are ten houses at least one of which is unoccupied. I went out there yesterday and was suspicious about whether there was anyone living in a couple of the others.

Those of you on the Commission in 1997 will remember that the area along Old Hickory Boulevard east of I-65 received a great deal of attention during the subarea update process. Area residents were very concerned about increasing the intensity of development in the area. They cited traffic congestion and overcrowding at Granberry Elementary School as the primary reasons for limiting the intensity of development. With respect to the issue of school overcrowding, there has been an expansion of Granberry Elementary School. This has reduced but not eliminated the use of portable classrooms. A further expansion is planned but not funded, and the Board of Education does intend to eventually build an additional elementary school to serve this zone. However – these changes will not address growth. They will simply address the current level of overcrowding, and something significant needs to be done. Staff agrees wholeheartedly that this is a major problem, regardless of whether seventy more homes are built in this spot or 170. This larger, countywide problem needs attention from the entire community.

Staff believes that there have been some changes in local conditions that may have some bearing on the question of appropriate development intensities for the area. These pertain to traffic and to homebuyer-

perception issues. One change is the Seven Springs office development that was approved for the area across Old Hickory Boulevard from this site after the Subarea 12 Plan: 1996 Update was amended to place Office Concentration policy in this location. The development approval resulted in the elimination of the extension of Trousdale Drive to Old Hickory Boulevard opposite Cloverland Drive. This will result in somewhat different traffic patterns in the area than were anticipated when the plan update was adopted. We would also like to analyze the annual rate of increase in traffic on widened Old Hickory Boulevard compared with the traffic capacity of the facility.

Three of the four properties for which the amendment has been requested contain single-family homes. The other parcel is vacant. The applicant maintains that the condition of the homes is deteriorating and that the vacant parcel has been on the market for over a year. I did observe some deterioration yesterday. These conditions may indicate that prospective buyers do not perceive the south side of Old Hickory Boulevard as a viable long-term single-family residential area. This is understandable given the fact that this small stretch of Old Hickory Boulevard is completely surrounded by either current or under-construction office development or by residential development that is of a different character in terms of housing type and/or orientation to Old Hickory Boulevard. Behind the Old Hickory Boulevard frontage, it is a different situation – this is older, established single-family development on fairly large lots. It is clearly well-maintained and should be viewed as stable.

For these reasons, staff believes that further analysis and discussion of amending the plan from Residential Low-Medium Density to Residential Medium Density is warranted. We would like for you to set this for your August 31 meeting. We also recommend that the Commission continue the practice it established when considering the recent Subarea 2 plan amendment request of holding one or more community meetings prior to the public hearing. We would like to work with Councilmember Jenkins on putting that together.

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Manier seconded the motion, which carried with Councilmember Ponder in opposition, to set the Subarea 12 Plan Amendment Consideration for August 31, 2000.

2. Endorsement of the Dickerson Road Commercial Area Plan

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

Resolution No. 2000-617

“WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Planning Commission directed staff to conduct meetings and workshops to provide the community the opportunity to work with the Commission’s staff on the development of a small area plan *Planning to Stay: the Dickerson Pike Commercial Area Plan* that was endorsed on July 20, 2000.

2000Z-021T

Urban Zoning Overlay District

A request to amend Sections 17.04 (General Provisions and Definitions), 17.12 (District Bulk Regulations), 17.20 (Parking, Loading, and Access), 17.24 (Landscaping, Buffering, and Tree Replacement), 17.36 (Overlay Districts), and 17.40 (Administration and Procedures) of the Zoning Regulations to apply the provisions of the Urban Zoning Overlay District, requested by Metropolitan Planning Commission staff. (Deferred from meeting of 7/6/00).

Ms. Wood presented Text Amendment 2000Z-021T and Zone Change 2000Z-094-U, which establish the Urban Zoning Overlay District. Both these items were deferred at the last meeting so that staff could respond to comments from the Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency and so that Metro Legal

could do further research on legal issues regarding the provisions for zoning with conditions. Staff is recommending approval of both items.

The text amendment establishes the Urban Zoning Overlay District and contains related provisions, some of which are countywide. Staff is recommending approval of this text amendment as revised. As the Commission knows, there have been some revisions since the last meeting, and staff has today handed out copies of a revision of what was mailed out last week, which is the graphic illustrating the corner lots provision. Staff will also be asking the Commission to approve the text amendment without the provisions relating to zoning with conditions.

Staff reviewing the Urban Zoning discussed MDHA's comments. MDHA had four issues they wanted us to address, three of which pertained to this text amendment and one of which pertained to the subdivision regulations. The first issue pertained to landscape buffers.

With respect to the new landscape buffers, you'll remember that for the UZO area, buffering options were added that involved the use of opaque fences or walls in combination with landscaping. MDHA was concerned there was a lack of clarity as to which side of the wall the landscaping materials are to be planted. The intent was for the landscaping to be on the side of the wall facing the less-intensive use. We added language to make this explicit. MDHA also raised an issue with respect to existing buffer requirements – this is a countywide issue. They informed us that the existing buffer requirements present a hardship for construction of affordable housing on small-width lots. We agree with this, and plan to address this through a process separate from the UZO ordinance. We believe that there are other countywide issues regarding the landscaping provisions that should also be addressed and prefer to address all of these issues in a separate process, preferably after the new Urban Forester has been hired.

MDHA also wanted us to refine the provisions for contextual front setbacks, which enable people in the UZO to construct buildings in accordance with the traditional setback patterns of the urban area by letting them use existing buildings as context to determine the front setbacks. For the most part, these provisions are voluntary. MDHA was concerned about the effectiveness of the provisions for a number of reasons. They cited a lack of clarity in the corner-lot provisions; a need to allow a previously existing building to be used to set context; and a need for incentives to encourage buildings to be set close to the street in neighborhood commercial/mixed use corner lot situations. The first two were pretty simple to address – we added clarifying language and we added language to enable a building that existed on the effective date of this Urban Zoning Ordinance to be used to determine context.

Staff discussed the incentives issue at some length with MDHA staff. They are concerned that the voluntary provisions will be underutilized to the degree that they will be ineffective, and are most concerned about this with reference to the corner lot provisions. We have added some language to the provisions to address the overall concerns about the effectiveness of contextual setbacks, such as some limitations on how far structures may be set back from the street. We have mandated the contextual setbacks in the corner lot situations, since these are of the greatest concern in terms of their impact on neighborhood character and such situations are limited in number.

We developed an incentive that allows for a parking reduction when buildings are constructed close to the street in areas where a property owner owns most of the parcels on the block.

To further address MDHA's concerns that smaller front/corner setbacks will not be implemented in the urban core, we have deleted the requirement for the concurrence of 2/3 of the property owners in the case where the Planning Department initiates the mandatory setbacks in accordance with an adopted plan. Our staff was also concerned that this was inconsistent with the manner in which Urban Design Overlays are established – we don't require signatures of property owners to establish those.

MDHA's third issue was connected with parking. The issue was that on-street parking spaces should be available to satisfy parking requirements for single-family lots where alleys provide rear access. Residential lots in the urban area are typically narrow and don't have driveways. People park at the backs of their lots

and on the streets in front of their houses. We agreed with MDHA's recommendation, and went somewhat further by allowing on-street parking to count toward meeting the parking requirements for single-family and duplex uses regardless of the presence of alleys.

MDHA's final issue was with the Subdivision Regulations – the 50' lot frontage requirement is a hardship for developing on smaller lots. Staff agrees with this and we will later be bringing forward an amendment to the subdivision regulations to remove this requirement.

Finally, the provisions dealing with zoning with conditions. You will remember that Metro Legal has been researching the legality of this technique in the state of Tennessee. David Diaz-Barriga of Metro Legal has informed us that he believes changes are needed to state enabling legislation to enable this provision to be used. We recommend removing the provisions from the text amendment. We intend to come back with it at a later date.

Staff is asking that you approve this amendment as revised today – that graphic will be added to the code along with the rest of the text amendment.

Councilmember Ponder stated that, as far the new lot goes, that is in a commercial zone, if a restaurant was built and wanted parking in the front, do they have to build their structure all the way up to the corner?

Ms. Wood stated these are largely situations within urban neighborhoods and they would have to be set up to the main street with parking in the rear.

Ms. Nielson reminded the Commission they had encouraged Harris Teeter in Hillsboro Village to put in some landscaping at the sidewalk. Are discouraging that now by putting the limitations on the building setback?

Mr. Bernhardt stated the ideal situation is that you have the travel lane, a parking lane, greenery, sidewalk and then the building.

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

Resolution No. 2000-618

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Change Proposal No. 2000Z-021T is **APPROVED (8-0) with revisions:**

Basis for approval with revisions for an additional graphic illustrating the corner lot provisions and removal of the provisions for zoning with conditions.

This text amendment establishes provisions for an Urban Zoning Overlay District (UZOD). The UZOD is appropriate to preserve and protect development that predates the mid-1950s and to ensure compatible new development within the overlay area. This amendment will significantly improve the ability of the Zoning Ordinance to implement numerous General Plan goals that are expressed throughout our community's planning documents. To help achieve these goals, provisions were developed to better regulate key physical characteristics of development within this community's urban areas. These provisions deal with placement and sizes of buildings and parking areas, landscaping, and required amounts of parking. The provisions significantly reduce the degree of nonconformity that results from applying zoning provisions designed for suburban environments to our urban areas. They will also encourage reinvestment by reducing required parking for several land uses, and allowing for further reductions where pedestrian and transit facilities are in place."

2000Z-094U-00

Maps 70, 71, 72, 80, 81, 82, 83, 91, 92, 93, 94, 103, 104, 105, 117, 118, 119
Various Parcels (37,640 parcels; 13,575 acres)
Subareas 5 (1994), 7 (2000), 8 (1994), 9 (1997), 10 (1994), and 11 (1999)
Districts 5 (Hall), 6 (Beehan), 7 (Campbell), 15 (Loring), 16 (McClendon), 17 (Greer), 18 (Hausser), 19 (Wallace), 20 (Haddox), 21 (Whitmore), 22 (Hand), 24 (Summers), and 25 (Shulman)

A request to apply the provisions of the Urban Zoning Overlay District, requested by Metropolitan Planning Commission Staff. (Deferred from meeting of 7/6/00).

Ms. Wood stated staff is recommending the provisions of the Urban Zoning Overlay District be applied to this area, which for the most part, correspond closely with the 1956 city limits of Nashville, with the exception of the Nolensville Road area extension.

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

Resolution No. 2000-619

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-094U-00 is **APPROVED (8-0)**:

This request applies the provisions of the Urban Zoning Overlay District (UZOD) to the urban core of Nashville. The UZOD is appropriate in the urban core to preserve and protect development that predates the mid-1950s and to ensure compatible new development within the overlay area."

2000Z-049U-05
Council Bill BL2000-215
Map 83-6, Parcel 271
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 6 (Beehan)

A council bill to change from R6 to MUL district property at 106 Chapel Avenue, approximately 190 feet north of Eastland Avenue (.68 acres), requested by Larry and Susan Hanson, appellants, for Chapel Church of Christ, owners.

Ms. Regen stated this item was referred back to the Planning Commission, by Councilmember Beehan, after the public hearing two weeks ago. The proposal is to take this piece of property from residential, R6 to MUL, Mixed use Limited. Earlier this year the Commission recommended disapproval of taking the property to MUL. The reason staff recommended disapproval was because by applying commercial zoning to this piece of property it would come too far back into the neighborhood. The church structure on this property is important to keep. Applying MUL would not preserve the structure because someone could always tear it down.

While assessing this and looking at the urban zoning, staff found there was not anything in place today or being proposed to address this situation. We want to protect and preserve the structure and allow some sort of use to occur but do not want to apply commercial zoning. Staff is recommending disapproval of the MUL zoning that is proposed for this piece of property.

Staff is recommending approval of the Neighborhood Landmark District. This district would be a new overlay district and would be applied to a particular piece of property. In this case, it would be applied to the church property, which the Planning Commission would review and recommend and the Council would approve it. Then we would have a neighborhood development plan. The applicant would come in with a

plan for the reuse of the church and identify specific uses to be allowed. Uses could be residential, office, commercial, retail, restaurant, doctor offices or a mixture. The Planning Commission would then review that plan and look at it with relationship to the surrounding uses, the neighborhood and the context. The Planning Commission would have final approval over the plan. There would be a public hearing held by the Planning Commission on the plan. The property would be posted and everyone within 300 feet of the property would be notified along with the neighborhood associations.

Ms. Nielson stated that if this is approved and the property was sold, what would happen to that Neighborhood Landmark District.

Mr. Bernhardt stated the Neighborhood Landmark District would become the zoning on the property and the new owner would have to conform with the conditions or come in and have it rezoned. The dilemma we had in addressing this was two fold. The rezoning of this property, or similar properties, you are rezoning it in order to preserve the building itself. This could apply to fire stations, schools or neighborhood commercial buildings in the middle of residential that everybody feels is part of their neighborhood. But, to rezone that to a blanket commercial zoning is not appropriate, because it does not protect the building itself.

Ms. Nielson asked if the language was specific enough that the Commission would not see it being abused or come back to haunt them.

Ms. Susan Hanson, applicant, stated she had operated the building adjacent to the Chapel Avenue Church of Christ for about 4 years. Our office was at home and then the opportunity came up to purchase that building. In that neighborhood there are a lot of people in similar situations of wanting to work away from their home but not being able to afford office space and not having the convenience of being close to home. The proposed use for the building is small offices, small post-production music operations, teaching music and there are theater groups interested in using the sanctuary for small performances.

Ms. Nielson asked what the Commission needed to do today, disapprove the MUL proposal and revise it and consider the Neighborhood Landmark District.

Chairman Lawson stated they could not consider the Neighborhood Landmark District because it was not a district yet.

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

Resolution No. 2000-620

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-049U-05 is **DISAPPROVED (7-0)**:

This request would extend commercial zoning too far into this residential area. The Subarea 5 Plan's Residential Medium (RM) policy, calling for 4 to 9 units per acre, encourages the conservation of the surrounding residential neighborhood where this church is located. Commercial uses are more appropriate along Eastland Avenue where there is existing underutilized commercially zoned properties."

ADDENDUM

2000Z-022T

Neighborhood Landmark District

A text amendment amending Chapters 17.36 (Overlay Districts) and 17.40 (Administration and Procedures: Overlay Districts) to add a "Neighborhood Land Mark District" and "Neighborhood Landmark

Development Plan” to preserve and protect buildings, structures, objects, sites and areas of historic, cultural, civic, neighborhood, or architectural value/and or significance within Davidson County, requested by Metro Planning Commission staff.

Mr. Manier stated this was a significant change and he had not had time to consider it.

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Manier seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to defer this matter for two weeks.

Mr. Small asked for a more in-depth presentation at the next meeting.

Mr. Manier stated you could argue the point that this is spot zoning and that he had a lot of questions to ask.

Mr. Bernhardt stated staff was prepared to answer those questions today, but that it would be better to do that at the next meeting after the Commission had time to study their information. This is a very important item and is also important as a tool this community can use to protect the continuity of the neighborhood.

Mr. Small stated that two meetings ago the Commission had the Cherokee Park discussion and had to make a decision as to whether or not that should have the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay. This room was packed and there was a lot of dissension in the neighborhood on whether or not to do this. On the day before, the Historic Commission voted they would approve this and then everybody came here to talk to us about it. After we set here for two hours and listened to people say whether or not they should have it – the ultimate decision came down by a comment from our legal counsel. That all we were doing was to determine whether or not it fit with the General Plan for that subarea. We listened to all of it but it was really irrelevant to the discussion we were making. So, if we are going to approve something like this we ought to understand the process of how the application is made, what are the criteria, under what guidelines would we be saying yes or no to something. That is going to set the precedent for future commissions to judge by. We need to be clear on and understand the process as well as what our roll is going to be.

Ms. Jones stated that over the last six months the Commission has looked at several overlays and that she had spent six years working on the rezoning package and that it seems like we are just modifying the rules and it’s beginning to look like a patchwork quilt on top of our original purpose.

Mr. Bernhardt stated that the bottom line of what the Commission is dealing with is trying to regulate a very complex urban situation that with uses that requires an equal level of dealing design issues. You can’t regulate the entire city based on design and it’s equally difficult to regulate the entire city based on uses. Until we find a way to marry those two in an appropriate balance we will continue to struggle.

Ms. Warren stated that a neighborhood that is very organized and very strong may have very specific buildings they might want to deem very important, but then it may cause problems in that neighborhood or community if they don’t agree. Also, if one church is approved and another one is disapproved it may cause problems.

Mr. Bernhardt stated he had a couple of items to consider and that he was not asking for endorsement by the Commission at this point.

Staff is trying to present the rezoning cases with a little more ties to the subarea plans and that is not unintentional. It is deliberate in terms of elevating the importance of the subarea planning process. One thing I am looking at is changing the zoning application to actually require identification of the subarea plans and whether or not it is consistent. I would like to require an application for amendment of the subarea plan where we have zoning changes that are not consistent to allow us to look at that. Even the possibility of going and looking at only amending the subarea plan 3 or 4 times a year on specific cases. We’ve gone through this subarea plan process and it needs to mean something to the community. It also gives us an opportunity, through the subarea plan amendment process, where we have a zone changes that is

inconsistent with the subarea plan, we are going to be requiring additional analysis. Including traffic analysis and impact on infrastructure analysis. The assumption being that zoning is consistent with the subarea plan and the plan has already anticipated those things. Zonings that are inconsistent with the subarea plan have not anticipated the impact on schools, parks and roads and that needs to be part of the information this Commission is given.

I feel we really ought to be having public hearings at this Commission on zone changes. I don't think it is fair to the public or the Commission not to have an opportunity to air those zone changes out. By the time items get to the Commission they tend to become more trivialized than they could be here if we are looking at them in a broader context with the input from the community. This Commission has the ability to defuse some of the more difficult issues and come to a little more balanced decision than might be possible in a more political environment.

OTHER BUSINESS

3. Legislative update

Councilmember Ponder provided an update on the current legislative status of items previously considered by the Commission.

PLATS PROCESSED ADMINISTRATIVELY

July 6, 2000 through July 19, 2000

- 97S-382G** **WILLOW VILLAGE, First Revision**
Designates three duplex lots
- 2000S-223U** **DASH CHATHAM SUBDIVISION**
Reconfigures two platted lots

- 2000S-227G** **HEATH HEIGHTS**
Combines two parcels into one lot

- 2000S-237U** **HICKORY PLAZA, Section 2 Lots 15 and 16**
Consolidates two lots into one lot

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, upon motion made, seconded and passed, the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

Minute Approval:
This 20th day of July, 2000