

MINUTES
OF THE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Date: October 26, 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
Marilyn Warren

Absent:

Mayor Bill Purcell
Frank Cochran
Douglas Small

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
Fred Colvert, Planner III
Jennifer Regen, Planner III
Robert Leeman, Planner I
Jeff Stuncard, Planner I
Jimmy Alexander, Planning Technician II

Community Plans Division:

Jerry Fawcett, Planning Division Manager

Advance Planning & Research:

Jeff Lawrence, Planner III
Michelle Kubant, Planner II
Amy McAbee-Cummings, Planner I
Marty Sewell, Planner I
Ryan Latimer, Planning Technician I

Others Present:

Jim Armstrong, Public Works
Brook Fox, Legal Department
Chris Koster, Mayor's Office
Mark Macy, Public Works

Chairman Lawson called the meeting to order.

Ms. Carrington introduced new staff members, Brooks Fox, with the Legal Department and Fred Colvert, Subdivision Section Leader.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Ms. Carrington announced the following corrections to the agenda:

Approval of Consent Agenda should be added.
2000S-340U-14 should be changed to 56 units.
2000Z-123U-05 should read - Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District.
2000Z-125G-02 should be changed to RS20.
98-85-P-14 should be - Part of Parcel 74

Ms. Nielson moved and Councilmember Ponder 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-311G-14 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.
2000S-328U-05 Deferred three meetings, by applicant.
2000S-329G-14 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.
2000S-340U-14 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.
2000Z-126G-12 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.
155-79-U-11 Deferred indefinitely, by applicant.
97P-041U-10 Deferred two weeks, by applicant.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilmember Ponder moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which unanimously passed, to approve the minutes of the called meeting of October 5, 2000, and the minutes of the regular meeting of October 12, 2000.

RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember Gilmore stated she had two items she would like to address the Commission on and that she would wait until the appropriate time to do that.

Councilmember Lineweaver thanked the Commission for adding the Max Vincent Property rehearing request to the agenda and stated he would address it when it came up on the agenda.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

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

SUBDIVISION PROPOSALS

2000S-316G-04

Dixie Pure Food Company's Subdivision,
Resubdivision of Lot 10
Map 43-2, Parcel 24
Subarea 4 (1998)
District 9 (Dillard)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into two lots abutting the west margin of Snow Avenue, approximately 602 feet north of Cedarwood Lane (2.05 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Kevin D. Wisner, owner/developer, Steven E. Artz and Associates, Inc., surveyor. (Deferred from meeting of 10/12/00).

Resolution No. 2000-779

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-316G-04, is **APPROVED WITH VARIANCES TO SECTIONS 2-4.2D, 2-4.2E AND 2-4.7 OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS (7-0)**

2000S-330U-03

Bryant Wood Trace Subdivision, Phase 1
Map 58, Part of Parcel 139
Subarea 3 (1998)
District 1 (Gilmore)

A request for final plat approval to create 10 lots abutting the east margin of Homeland Drive, approximately 610 feet south of Echo Lane (10.77 acres), classified within the RS40 District, requested by Walter and Ellen L. Bryant, Jr. et al, owners/developers, Neel-Schaffer, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-780

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-330U-03, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$205,500 (7-0).”**

2000S-335G-01

James Spivey Property
Map 31, Parcel 86
Subarea 1 (1997)
District 1 (Gilmore)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one parcel into three lots abutting the west margin of Lickton Pike, opposite Ingram Road (7.84 acres), classified within the AR2a District, requested by Lettie Mae S. Brown, owner/developer, Land Surveying, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-781

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-335G-01, is **APPROVED (7-0).”**

2000S-336G-10
High Ridge, Phase 2
Map 159, Parcel 240
Subarea 10 (1994)
District 33 (Turner)

A request for final plat approval to create 24 lots abutting the southeast termini of Camelot Road and Radnor Glen Drive, approximately 200 feet southeast of Lancelot Road (34.3 acres), classified within the R40 District, requested by High Ridge, LLC, owner/developer, Land Surveying Consultants, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-782

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-336G-10, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$198,500 (7-0).”**

2000S-338G-14
Phillips Acres
Map 86, Parcel 40
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 12 (Ponder)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into three lots abutting the north margin of Old Lebanon Dirt Road, opposite Carriage Way Court (1.44 acres), classified within the RS15 District, requested by Dana M. Phillips, owner/developer, Crawford Land Surveyors, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-783

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-338G-14, is **APPROVED WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-4.2E OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS (7-0).”**

2000S-342G-04
W. P. Ready, Resubdivision of Lot 2
Map 43-5, Parcel 14
Subarea 4 (1998)
District 9 (Dillard)

A request for final plat approval to subdivide one lot into two lots abutting the north margin of Anderson Lane, opposite Brooks Avenue (1.56 acres), classified within the RS7.5 District, requested by Dorothy Carver Shelton, trustee, owner/developer, Tommy E. Walker, surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-784

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-342G-04, is **APPROVED WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-4.2D OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS (7-0).”**

2000S-344G-06
Nashville Highlands, Phase 1
Map 128, Part of Parcel 154
Subarea 6 (1996)
District 23 (Bogen)

A request for final plat approval to create Phase 1 and access easements and utility easements in conjunction with the development of a condominium complex abutting the east margin of Old Hickory Boulevard, approximately 4,372 feet north of Memphis-Bristol Highway (69.8 acres), classified within the R20 and R15 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Nashville Highlands, LLC, owner/developer, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 2000-785

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-344G-06, is **APPROVED SUBJECT TO A BOND OF \$2,500,000 (7-0).”**

ZONE CHANGE AND PUD PROPOSALS

2000Z-125G-02
Map 7, Parcels 51 and 173
Subarea 2 (1995)
District 10 (Balthrop)

A request to change from AR2a to R20 district property abutting the northeast margin of Dickerson Pike, approximately 1,694 feet northwest of Tinnin Road (4.74 acres), requested by Randall E. and Beverly J. Woodard, owners.

Resolution No. 2000-786

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the following Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-125G-02 is **APPROVED (7-0)**:

These properties fall within the Subarea 2 Plan’s Residential Low Medium (RLM) policy calling for residential uses at up to 4 units per acre. The RS20 district is consistent with that policy and the area’s emerging zoning pattern."

2000Z-128U-05
Map 60-4, Parcel 4
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 4 (Majors)

A request to change from RS10 to CS district property at 333 Homestead Road, approximately 715 feet west of Dickerson Pike (1.02 acres), requested by William M. Coats, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-787

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the following Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-128U-05 is **APPROVED (7-0)**:

This property falls within the Subarea 5 Plan's Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) policy calling for office, commercial, and higher density residential uses. The CS district is consistent with that policy and the area's predominant commercial zoning pattern."

2000Z-130U-10
Council Bill No. BL2000-486
Map 118-6, Parcel 162
Subarea 10 (1994)
District 17 (Greer)

A council bill to rezone from OL to R10 and SCC districts property at Gale Lane (unnumbered), approximately 100 feet east of Vaulx Lane (7.19 acres), requested by Councilmember Ronnie Greer, for Land Trust Corporation, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-788

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the following Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-130U-10 is **APPROVED (7-0)**:

This property falls within the Subarea 10 Plan's Residential Low Medium (RLM) policy and Retail Concentration Community (RCC) policy. The RLM policy calls for residential uses at a maximum of 4 units per acre and the RCC policy calls for commercial uses at a community scale around the Gale Lane/Interstate 65 interchange. The R10 and SCC districts are consistent with those policies."

89P-022U-10
Council Bill No. BL2000-485
Melrose Shopping Center
Map 118-6, Parcel 162
Subarea 10 (1994)
District 17 (Greer)

A council bill to amend a portion of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the northwest margin of Gale Lane, approximately 642 feet southwest of Franklin Pike, classified OL and proposed for R10 and SCC (7.2 acres), to permit a 48,000 square foot retail building, replacing a 36,000 square foot church, requested by Councilmember Ronnie Greer, for Land Trust Corporation, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-789

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 89P-022U-10 is given **APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMMERCIAL PUD (7-0)**."

61-77-G-01
Gifford Property
Map 22, Parcel 201
Subarea 1 (1997)
District 1 (Gilmore)

A request for final approval for a phase of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the terminus of Gifford Place, 220 feet east of Whites Creek Pike, classified CS (1.30 acres), to

develop a 12,000 square foot office building, requested by Harry Martin, architect, for William C. Gifford, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-790

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 61-77-G-01 is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PHASE OF THE COMMERCIAL PUD (7-0)**. The following condition applies:

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.”

117-83-U-14

Music City Outlet Center (Wendy’s)
Map 62, Parcel 34
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 15 (Loring)

A request for final approval for a phase of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the north margin of McGavock Pike and the west margin of Outlet Center Drive, classified CA (.39 acres), to develop a 3,200 square foot fast-food restaurant as approved on the preliminary plan, requested by Ragan-Smith Associates, for Music Valley Partners, LP, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-791

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 117-83-U-14 is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PHASE OF THE COMMERCIAL PUD (7-0)**. The following condition applies:

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.”

98-85-P-14

Lakeside - Phase 4
Map 122, Part of Parcel 74
Map 122, Parcel 6
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 13 (Derryberry)

A request for final approval for Phase Four of the Residential Planned Unit Development District located abutting the east margin of Bell Road, opposite Pleasant Hill Road, classified RM9 (7.77 acres), to develop 32 single-family lots, where 32 single-family lots were approved on the preliminary plan, requested by LDI Design Inc., for Denzel Carbine, owner. (Deferred from meeting of 10/12/00).

Resolution No. 2000-792

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 98-85-P-14 is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR PHASE 4 (7-0)**. The following conditions apply:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the recording of a final subdivision plat including the posting of a bond for all required public improvements.

2. 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.”

28-87-P-06

Boone Trace, Part of Phase VI
Map 126, Parcel 139
Subarea 6 (1996)
District 23 (Bogen)

A request for final approval for a phase of the Residential Planned Unit Development District located abutting the southern terminus of Settlers Way, north of Newsom Station Road, classified RS20 (7.83 acres), to develop 25 single-family lots where 25 lots were approved on the preliminary plan, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, for Tenn Contractors, Inc., owner. (Deferred from meetings of 9/28/00 and 10/12/00).

Resolution No. 2000-793

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 28-87-P-06 is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR 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, the recording of a final subdivision plat including the posting of a bond for all required public improvements.”

93P-012G-14

The Lakes-West
Map 109, Parcel 8
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 13 (Derryberry)

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for the undeveloped Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the southeast corner of Lincoya Bay Drive and Bell Road, classified RM15 (4.12 acres), to permit the development of 44 multi-family units and a 2,022 square foot rental office, replacing the 52 multi-family units on the approved preliminary plan, requested by Bernard L. Weinstein & Associates for Lakes Multi-Family Land, LLC, owners.

Resolution No. 2000-794

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 93P-012G-14 is given **APPROVAL OF A REVISION TO THE PRELIMINARY PLAN AND CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL (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, the recording of a final subdivision plan, including the posting of a bond for all required public improvements.”

98P-007U-12

Seven Springs
Map 160, Parcel 243 and Part of Parcel 44
Subarea 12 (1997)
District 32 (Jenkins)

A request to revise the preliminary plan and for final approval for a phase of the undeveloped Planned Unit Development District abutting the north margin of Old Hickory Boulevard, opposite Cloverland Drive, classified OR20 (30.695 acres), to develop a 133,905 square foot 5-story office building and a 106,764 square foot 4-story office building, replacing two 4-story office buildings with 115,000 square feet each on the approved preliminary plan, requested by Ragan-Smith Associates, for Highwood Properties, Inc.

Resolution No. 2000-795

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 98P-007U-12 is given **APPROVAL OF A REVISION TO THE PRELIMINARY PLAN, CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PHASE AND FINAL PLAT APPROVAL (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, the recording of a revised subdivision plat that revises the easements to allow the construction of these two office buildings.
3. Prior to the issuance of any Use and Occupancy permits for any building or structure, off-site improvements will be completed and approved by the Metropolitan Department of Public Works and the Metro Traffic Engineer. The required improvements are as follows:
 - a) A right-turn lane into the Seven Springs development for the entire length of the Seven Springs project fronting Old Hickory Boulevard to be constructed on the north side of Old Hickory Boulevard;
 - b) Modification of the traffic signal at the intersection of Old Hickory Boulevard and Cloverland Drive to accommodate traffic from the Seven Springs development; and,
 - c) An additional left-turn lane on Cloverland Drive onto Old Hickory Boulevard requiring the acquisition of additional right-of-way by Metro Government from the west side of Cloverland Drive.
4. Seven Springs Associates, LLC, shall submit a Letter of Commitment by October 31, 2000 to Mark Macy, the Assistant Director of Public Works, indicating Seven Springs Associates, LLC, commitment to provide \$70,000 for the Cloverland Drive improvements detailed in Condition #3(c) above. In the event, construction costs and right-of-way acquisition exceeds \$70,000.00, Seven Springs Associates, LLC will contribute up to an additional \$25,000.00 (total \$95,000.00). This additional amount shall be paid by Seven Springs LLC upon notification and documentation of such additional costs by Metro Public Works. These funds shall be used by Metro Government to acquire the necessary right-of-way and to construct the required left-hand turn lane. That letter shall satisfy the applicant’s obligations under Condition #3(c) above.”

MANDATORY REFERRALS

2000M-097U-05
Closure of Portion of Turner Street
Map 72-15, Parcel 270

Subarea 5 (1994)
District 7 (Campbell)

A request to close a portion of Turner Street from Riverside Drive to the western edge of parcel 270 on tax map 72-15, requested by Nancy Sutton of Seals Realtors and Auction Company, Inc., appellant. (Deferred from meeting of 10/12/00).

Resolution No. 2000-796

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0) with conditions** Proposal No. 2000M-097U-05:

2000M-121U-13
Dell Computer Sign Encroachment
Map 120, Parcel 85
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 27 (Sontany)

A request to encroach 2 feet in width by 20 feet in length into Dell Parkway with a 10' tall ground monument sign, requested by Mark Spalding of Gresham, Smith and Partners, appellant, for Dell Computer Corporation. (Deferred from meeting of 10/12/00).

Resolution No. 2000-797

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-121U-13:

2000M-125U-13
Metro Airport Sewer Line and
Easement Abandonment
Map 108, Parcel 66
Map 121, Parcel 4
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 13 (Derryberry)

A request for a sewer line (approximately 6,272 feet in length) and easement to be abandoned and then converted to a private sewer service line by the Metropolitan Nashville Airport Authority, Project No. 99-SL-247, located on Donelson Pike, south of I-40, classified within the AR2a and IWD Districts on 1,625 acres, requested by the Department of Water Services.

Resolution No. 2000-798

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-1125U-13:

2000M-127U-05
3010 Ambrose Avenue Property Sale
Map 72-5, Parcel 177
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 4 (Majors)

A request to sell a parcel of property located at 3010 Ambrose Avenue, classified within the IR District on .34 acres, requested by the Public Property Administration for Metro Government, owner.

Resolution No. 2000-799

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-127U-05:

OTHER BUSINESS

1. MPO contract with Bucher, Willis & Ratliff for the development of a Major Thoroughfare Plan for the City of Goodlettsville.

Resolution No. 2000-800

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES** the MPO contract with Bucher, Willis & Ratliff for the development of a Major Thoroughfare Plan for the City of Goodlettsville."

This concluded the items on the consent agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING: SUBAREA 3 PLAN AMENDMENT

Mr. Fawcett explained that the purpose of the public hearing was to consider whether or not the boundary between the Natural Conservation land use policy area and the Industrial and Distribution land use policy area should be changed in the vicinity of Ashland City Highway just west of the Briley Parkway interchange. He gave a description and showed slides of the physical characteristics of the area and stated that these provided the primary basis for the location of the existing policy area boundary. He explained that the boundary issue arose from a request to change zoning on property from the AR2a district to the IR district. The property is located in the Natural Conservation policy area, which does not support industrial zoning.

The purpose of the Natural Conservation land use policy is to protect environmentally sensitive land. It is applied to areas that are predominantly characterized by steep slopes, unstable soils or flood plain. Mr. Fawcett explained that only zoning districts permitting land use development that is consistent with this purpose should be applied within areas of Natural Conservation policy. Most of the land that is within the Natural Conservation policy area along the portion of the boundary being considered for change is steeply sloped or is within a flood plain. Mr. Fawcett noted that there is only one portion of the area along the boundary, a former quarry site that might reasonably be considered for change. Since its natural features have been obliterated by the quarry operation, the Natural Conservation policy no longer serves a protective purpose. He showed an alternative boundary location incorporating the quarry site into the Industrial and Distribution policy area on the basis of its altered physical character. This change would place the boundary between the two policy areas along Ashland City Highway. He noted that roadways are not desirable policy boundaries because they blur distinctions by providing equal access and exposure to properties on both sides of the road.

A community meeting was held on this boundary issue on Wednesday evening, October 18th, at the Northwest YMCA. It was attended by the district Councilmember Brenda Gilmore and about a dozen area residents. The attendance was low because of conflicts with church programs. Mr. Fawcett presented this same information and showed the alternative boundary change. All but one of those present were strongly against changing the boundary because of concerns that it would set in motion the establishment of industrial uses along Ashland City Highway. One of the attendees noted that many others who did not

attend because of church meetings had asked him to voice their opposition to any industrial zoning along Ashland City Highway.

Mr. Fawcett concluded his presentation by recommending that the existing land use policy boundary be retained because it is the best choice and because the community opposes any change. He noted that staff is proposing an alternative solution to the land use issue that brought about consideration of a policy boundary amendment. This alternative is a zoning text amendment that would allow outdoor storage as a special exception in certain zoning districts applied in rural areas. Staff in conjunction with zone change request 2000Z-115G-03 would present this alternative.

Mr. Steve Henry, area resident, agreed with planning staff and stated the neighbors wanted to keep the present zoning on the property.

Councilmember Gilmore stated it was clear the neighborhood did not want the subarea plan opened or the change approved. So, therefore, I support the neighborhood.

Ms. Nielson moved and Councilmember Ponder seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to close the public hearing and accept staff recommendation of not amending the Subarea 3 Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING: AMENDMENT TO SUBDIVISION REGULATION

A request to amend Section 2-6 (Streets and Pedestrian Ways) by modifying street design standards to make them consistent with revised Public Works Subdivision Construction Specification Drawings, and identifying location requirements for sidewalks.

Ms. McAbee-Cummings explained the following recommended amendment to the Subdivision Regulations.

2-6 Streets and Pedestrian Ways

October 26 Agenda

2-6.1 Pedestrian Ways

- A. Sidewalks — Sidewalks shall be required in all subdivisions except those proposed within industrial zones and ~~low density residential zones as defined by the Metropolitan Zoning Regulations~~ residential developments where lots have a frontage of 75 feet or greater. ~~Within commercial zones, the developer will not be required to install sidewalks along an existing street.~~ Residential subdivisions proposed to accommodate housing affordable to families of less than median income, and in which the cost for infrastructure development is paid principally by public funds, shall be exempt from these sidewalk requirements.

Sidewalks shall be required on one side of a street, except that along arterial routes sidewalks shall be required on both sides. When sidewalks are to be constructed in a subdivision adjoining a developed area with sidewalks, the sidewalks shall be joined. ~~and extended along the same side of the street.~~ Transition of sidewalks from one side of a street to another will be permitted when topography makes continuation along the same side of the street impractical. Transitions shall be made only at street intersections. In residential zones, sidewalks will not be required on permanent dead-end streets less than 300 feet in length.

Sidewalks, where required, shall be included within the dedicated non-trafficway portion of the right-of-way of all roads as ~~indicated in the~~

~~following table. In residential areas,~~ Where concrete curbs are required or constructed, strips of grassed or landscaped areas at least ~~two (2)~~ **four (4)** feet wide shall separate all sidewalks from adjacent curbs, except that within ten (10) feet of street intersections no grass strip will be required. Construction detail shall conform to the Metropolitan Department of Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications. Where sidewalks are required to be constructed along existing substandard streets or along existing or planned streets designated as collector routes on the Collector Plan, the sidewalks shall be located in relation to the future curb line. The design cross section as set forth in the Metropolitan Department of Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications shall be used as a location guide.

In all residential **and commercial** districts, including the low density residential zones, sidewalks shall be required along streets proposed for public dedication which are within **a one and one-half mile radius of any school**, *(this is the distance a child must live from his or her school before bus service will be provided)* **and within a one-half mile radius of and leading to any** community facility activity or commercial activity, **which includes, but is not limited to, libraries, parks, and commercial, mixed-use, or office zones.** ~~(as classified within the Metropolitan Zoning Regulations) that are determined by the Planning Commission to be pedestrian attractors. The Planning Commission will from time to time publish a list of such attractors.~~

Sidewalk width shall be as follows:

TYPE OF STREET	RESIDENTIAL STREET	NON-RESIDENTIAL STREET
MINOR LOCAL STREET	4 5 FEET WIDE	5 FEET WIDE
LOCAL STREET	5 FEET WIDE	5 FEET WIDE
COLLECTOR STREET	5 FEET WIDE	5 FEET WIDE

(The table above will be replaced with the following sentence:)

All sidewalks shall be a minimum of five (5) feet wide.

NOTE

Width shall be exclusive of encroachments such as utility poles, fire hydrants, parking meters, sign standards, street furniture, etc. The grass strip or ~~two-foot~~ **four-foot** clearance area behind the curb is intended for those purposes.

(Table amended 10/26/00)

- B. Pedestrian Access Easements — To facilitate pedestrian access from the roads to schools, parks, playgrounds, or other nearby facilities, the Planning Commission may require perpetual unobstructed easements or dedications at least ten (10) feet in width parallel to side lot lines. Easements shall be indicated on the plat as “pedestrian access easement.”

2-6.2 Street Requirements — The following requirements shall apply to all streets both public and private.

2-6.2.1 Street Design Standards

- A. Sight Distance — Sight distance along streets and at intersections shall be not less than the minimum horizontal and vertical distances as specified in the AASHTO Manual, current edition, for the class of street under consideration.
- B. Grades and Cross-slopes — Maximum grades shall be as specified in Table 1. Cross slopes of all streets shall be in accordance with the Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications.
- C. Vertical Design — Vertical design shall be in accordance with the current edition of the AASHTO Manual. The vertical design speed of a street shall be equal to or greater than the horizontal design speed of that street. The maximum grades shall not exceed those given in Table 1. The developer shall show on the plans the “K” value and the design speed of each vertical curve, and the design speed of each horizontal curve.

TABLE 1
MAXIMUM GRADES BY
TYPE/INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT

Type of Street	<u>Up to (and including) 9 Residential Units per Acre</u>	<u>Greater than 9 Residential Units per Acre</u>	<u>Non-Residential</u>
Minor Local	12*	12*	N/A
Local	10*	8	6
Collector	8	6	8

*Steeper grades may be permitted when such is necessary to lessen environmental impacts resulting from designs to meet lesser grades, provided all other design criteria are satisfied. Minimum grades on all roads shall be one percent (1%). (Table Amended 10-26-00)

- D. Right-of-Way and Pavement Width — Minimum right-of-way and pavement width shall be as indicated in Table 2.

Pavement and curb transitions shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications.

Whenever possible, four moving lanes should be avoided in residential areas except for required arterial or collector streets. Four lanes may be warranted for short distances at entrances to larger developments.

One-way streets may be permitted and, in some cases, desirable for loop streets or where there is a need to separate the directional lanes to preserve natural features or to avoid excessive grading for street construction on slopes.

TABLE 2
MINIMUM RIGHT-OF-WAY OR EASEMENT AND PAVEMENT WIDTH (in feet)
BY TYPE/INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT

Type of Street	<u>2-4 (including 4) Residential Units</u>	<u>4-9 (including 9) Residential Units</u>	<u>Greater than 9 Residential Units</u>	<u>Non-Residential</u>
----------------	--	--	---	------------------------

	per Acre		per Acre		per Acre		ROW	Pavement
	ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement		
MINOR LOCAL (REVISED)	40 _a ST-250 46 _a <u>ST-251</u>	23 _b 23	40 ST-251 46 _a <u>ST-251</u>	23 _b 23	40 N/A	23 _b N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
LOCAL (REVISED)	50 46 _a <u>ST-251</u>	27 _b 23	50 ST-252 50 <u>ST-252</u>	27 _b 27	60 ST-252 60 <u>ST-253</u>	37 _c 37	60 ST-260 60 ST-260	37 _c 37
COLLECTOR (REVISED)	60	37 _d	60 ST-252 60 <u>ST-253</u>	37 _b 37	72 ST-253 72 <u>ST-254</u>	49 _e 49	72 ST-261 72 ST-261	49 _c 49

Type of Street	Residential			Non- Residential		
	ROW	PAVEMENT	SHOULDER	ROW	PAVEMENT	MEDIAN
<u>RURAL</u>	50 ST-255	20	2 @ 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
<u>DIVIDED</u>	70 ST-250	2 @ 16c	N/A	88 ST-262	2 @ 25c	14

a The Planning Commission may permit a right-of-way of thirty (30) feet minimum width when the subdivision is within a zone district classified as a Reduced Lot Development District as defined by the Metropolitan Zoning Regulations.

~~b Curbs required; either mountable curb and gutter or standard curb and gutter depending on the characteristics of the street where applied. (Refer to Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications, Drawings ST-200 and ST-202.)~~

~~c Standard curb and gutter required. (Refer to Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications, Drawing ST-200)~~

b When it is found to be in the public's interest, a noncurb street design cross section in accordance with Public Works Subdivision Construction Specification may be permitted in low density residential zoning. ([Refer to Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications, Drawing ST-255](#))

*UPA= Units Per Acre (Table Amended 7-30-92 [10/26/00](#))

Mr. Harold Delk, Anderson & Delk, stated the item under paragraph "A" characterized as a clarification may be a clarification as staff sees it but from the developers side it is very definitely a change in the rules. The previous stipulation for where sidewalks were not required was in low district zones as described by the Zoning Regulations, which sets certain densities, not size of lots. If you change to size of lots it significantly changes the intent of what the old regulations did. That may be what staff wants to do, but don't describe it as a clarification. Describe it as a change, because that is what it amounts to. The other item is, that a few years ago when Micky Sullivan was at Public Works, we went through a rather lengthy process with him to revise certain regulations of the Public Works Department. If you follow the changes that have occurred over the past year, in the Public Works regulations, some of the drawings in this document have changed 3 to 4 times. Every time they change the Planning Department is going to be in disagreement again or will have to change again. The Planning Department should say for the developer to abide by the Public Works regulations and it would simplify the possibility of conflict.

Mr. Bernhardt stated low density residential zones basically are R20 and higher and that is what we have defined, 20,000 square feet, which is a clarification and not a change. Also, it would be more consistent to

be able to reflect in the Subdivision Regulations and the Public Works drawings the same information. Granted, if the Public Works drawings change Planning would need to make adjustments.

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

Resolution No. 2000-801

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it approves the amendment to the Subdivision Regulations as follows:

2-6 Streets and Pedestrian Ways

2-6.1 Pedestrian Ways

- A. Sidewalks — Sidewalks shall be required on one side of the street in all subdivisions except those proposed within industrial zones and residential zones with minimum required lot sizes 20,000 square feet or greater. Residential subdivisions proposed to accommodate housing affordable to families of less than median income, and in which the cost for infrastructure development is paid principally by public funds, shall be exempt from these sidewalk requirements. Sidewalks shall be required on one side of a street, except that along arterial routes sidewalks shall be required on both sides. When sidewalks are to be constructed in a subdivision adjoining a developed area with sidewalks, the sidewalks shall be joined. and extended along the same side of the street. Transition of sidewalks from one side of a street to another will be permitted when topography makes continuation along the same side of the street impractical. Transitions shall be made only at street intersections. In residential zones, sidewalks will not be required on permanent dead-end streets less than 300 feet in length.-

Sidewalks, where required, shall be included within the dedicated non-trafficway portion of the right-of-way of all roads. Where concrete curbs are required or constructed, strips of grassed or landscaped areas at least four (4) feet wide shall separate all sidewalks from adjacent curbs, except that within ten (10) feet of street intersections no grass strip will be required. Construction detail shall conform to the Metropolitan Department of Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications.

Where sidewalks are required to be constructed along existing substandard streets or along existing or planned streets designated as collector routes on the Collector Plan, the sidewalks shall be located in relation to the future curb line. The design cross section as set forth in the Metropolitan Department of Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications shall be used as a location guide.

In all residential and commercial districts, including the low density residential zones, sidewalks shall be required along streets proposed for public dedication which are within a one and one-half mile radius of any school, and within a one-half mile radius of any community facility activity or commercial activity, which includes, but is not limited to, libraries, parks, and commercial, mixed-use, or office zones.

All sidewalks shall be a minimum of five (5) feet wide.

NOTE

Width shall be exclusive of encroachments such as utility poles, fire hydrants, parking meters, sign standards, street furniture, etc. The grass strip or four-foot clearance area behind the curb is intended for those purposes.

- B. Pedestrian Access Easements — To facilitate pedestrian access from the roads to schools, parks, playgrounds, or other nearby facilities, the Planning Commission may require perpetual unobstructed easements or dedications at least ten (10) feet in width parallel to side lot lines. Easements shall be indicated on the plat as “pedestrian access easement.”

2-6.2 Street Requirements — The following requirements shall apply to all streets both public and private.

2-6.2.1 Street Design Standards

- A. Sight Distance — Sight distance along streets and at intersections shall be not less than the minimum horizontal and vertical distances as specified in the AASHTO Manual, current edition, for the class of street under consideration.
- B. Grades and Cross-slopes — Maximum grades shall be as specified in Table 1. Cross slopes of all streets shall be in accordance with the Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications.
- C. Vertical Design — Vertical design shall be in accordance with the current edition of the AASHTO Manual. The vertical design speed of a street shall be equal to or greater than the horizontal design speed of that street. The maximum grades shall not exceed those given in Table 1. The developer shall show on the plans the “K” value and the design speed of each vertical curve, and the design speed of each horizontal curve.

TABLE 1
MAXIMUM GRADES BY
TYPE/INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT

Type of Street	Up to (and including) 9 Residential Units per Acre	Greater than 9 Residential Units per Acre	Non-Residential
Minor Local	12*	12*	N/A
Local	10*	8	6
Collector	8	6	8

*Steeper grades may be permitted when such is necessary to lessen environmental impacts resulting from designs to meet lesser grades, provided all other design criteria are satisfied. Minimum grades on all roads shall be one percent (1%). (Table Amended 10-26-00)

- D. Right-of-Way and Pavement Width — Minimum right-of-way and pavement width shall be as indicated in Table 2. Pavement and curb

transitions shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications.

Whenever possible, four moving lanes should be avoided in residential areas except for required arterial or collector streets. Four lanes may be warranted for short distances at entrances to larger developments.

One-way streets may be permitted and, in some cases, desirable for loop streets or where there is a need to separate the directional lanes to preserve natural features or to avoid excessive grading for street construction on slopes.

TABLE 2
MINIMUM RIGHT-OF-WAY OR EASEMENT AND PAVEMENT WIDTH (in feet)
BY TYPE/INTENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT

Type of Street		2-4 (including 4) Residential Units per Acre		4-9 (including 9) Residential Units per Acre		Greater than 9 Residential Units per Acre		Non-Residential	
MINOR LOCAL	<i>Dwg No.</i>	ST-251		ST-251		N/A		N/A	
		ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement				
		46 _a	23	46 _a	23				
LOCAL	<i>Dwg No.</i>	ST-251		ST-252		ST-253		ST-260	
		ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement
		46 _a	23	50	27	60	37	60	37
COLLECTOR	<i>Dwg No.</i>	ST-253		ST-253		ST-254		ST-261	
		ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement	ROW	Pavement
		60	37 _b	60	37	72	49	72	49

Type of Street	Residential			Non- Residential		
	ROW	PAVEMENT	SHOULDER	ROW	PAVEMENT	MEDIAN
RURAL	DWG. NO. ST-255					
	50	20	2 @ 8	N/A	N/A	N/A
DIVIDED	DWG. NO. ST-250			DWG. NO. ST-262		
	70	2 @ 16	N/A	88	2 @ 25	14

a The Planning Commission may permit a right-of-way of thirty (30) feet minimum width when the subdivision is within a zone district classified as a Reduced Lot Development District as defined by the Metropolitan Zoning Regulations. As provided in Section 2-6.1, sidewalks are not required in residential zones with minimum required lot sizes of 20,000 square feet or greater.

b When it is found to be in the public's interest, a noncurb street design cross section in accordance with Public Works Subdivision Construction Specification may be permitted in low density residential zoning. (Refer to Public Works Subdivision Construction Specifications, Drawing ST-255)

(Table Amended 10/26/00)"

SUBDIVISION PROPOSALS

2000S-051G-14 (Public Hearing)

Rock Crest Subdivision
Map 75, Parcel 142
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 12 (Ponder)

A request for preliminary approval for 25 lots abutting the east margin of Tulip Grove Road, approximately 390 feet north of Tulip Grove Lane (10.0 acres), classified within the RS15 District, requested by Tim Grindstaff, owner/developer, Dale and Associates, surveyor. (Deferred indefinitely from meeting of 8/31/00).

Mr. Stuncard stated staff is recommending approval. This item had been indefinitely deferred at one point to address concerns regarding a road stub to the southern boundary. The road has now been reconfigured and has met Public Works approval.

Ms. Christine Clinard, Ms. Barbara Collins and Ms. Laura Petty spoke in opposition to the proposal and expressed concerns regarding heavy density, traffic, safety, traffic accidents on Tulip Grove Lane, property value depreciation and type of homes to be built on the property. Ms. Collins submitted a petition in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to close the public hearing.

Mr. Stuncard stated the location of this property is on a hill and in a curve, but that TDOT has future plans to realign that curve in two to three years.

Councilmember Ponder stated the speed limit on this stretch of the road has recently been lowered from 40 miles per hour to 30 miles per hour.

Ms. Oglesby stated there are serious concerns with the traffic, but the owner has the right to develop it.

Councilmember Ponder stated all of the neighboring lots in this proposal are RS15 and are based on the same zoning.

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

Resolution No. 2000-802

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-051G-14, is **APPROVED; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (7-0).”**

2000S-337G-14 (Public Hearing)

Louise Davis Property
Map 98, Parcel 54
Subarea 14 (1996)
District 12 (Ponder)

A request for preliminary approval for six lots abutting the southeast corner of John Hager Road and South New Hope Road (3.1 acres), classified within the RS15 District, requested by Bob and Louise Davis, owners/developers, MEC, Inc., surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard stated staff is recommending approval. There is a 4 to 1 lot size variance request for lot 6 in the rear. Due to location of the existing structure and the shape of the lot staff feels the variance is justified.

Ms. Brenda Womack expressed concerns regarding the size and value of the homes to be built.

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

Resolution No. 2000-803

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-337G-14, is **APPROVED WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-4.2E OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (7-0).”**

2000S-339U-13 (Public Hearing)
Hickory Hollow Fellowship
Map 149, Parcels 141, 142 and 143
Subarea 13 (1996)
District 28 (Alexander)

A request for preliminary approval for three lots abutting the southeast margin of Rural Hill Road, approximately 1,280 feet south of Rice Road (5.49 acres), classified within the R10 District, requested by Jeff Thomas, owner/developer, Dale and Associates, surveyor.

Mr. Stuncard stated staff is recommending approval. Due topography and the existence of a structure a variance is required on lot three for the 4 to 1 ratio.

No one was present to speak at the public hearing.

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

Resolution No. 2000-804

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 2000S-339U-13, is **APPROVED WITH A VARIANCE TO SECTION 2-4.2E OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS; PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED (7-0).”**

ZONE CHANGE AND PUD PROPOSALS

2000Z-115G-03
Council Bill No. BL2000-471
Map 68, Parcel 29
Subarea 3 (1998)
District 1 (Gilmore)

A council bill to rezone from AR2a to IR district property at Ashland City Highway (unnumbered), approximately 560 feet west of Old Hydes Ferry Pike (13.19 acres), requested by Joe Hall of The Ingram Group, appellant, for Hailey's Harbor, Inc., owner. (Deferred from meeting of 9/28/00).

Ms. Regen stated staff is recommending disapproval. The Commission has approved no amendment to the subarea plan so this property remains within a natural conservation area.

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

Resolution No. 2000-805

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the following Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-115G-03 is **DISAPPROVED (7-0)** as contrary to the General Plan:

These properties fall within the Subarea 3 Plan's Natural Conservation (NC) policy calling for protection of the area's steep hillsides and very low-density residential development at a maximum of 4 residential units per acre. The IR district is not consistent with that policy. Additionally, there is no sewer service in this area to support development intensification."

2000Z-123U-05
Council Bill No. BL2000-456
Map 83-6, Parcel 271
Subarea 5 (1994)
District 6 (Beehan)

A council bill to apply the Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District to property at 106 Chapel Avenue, approximately 175 feet north of Eastland Avenue, zoned R6 District (.68 acres), requested by Larry and Susan Hanson, appellant, for Chapel Avenue Church of Christ, owner.

Ms. Regen stated staff is recommending approval and reviewed the requirements and process of this zoning district. The intent of this district is to protect features within a neighborhood and to encourage reuse of structures in residential areas without rezoning the property.

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

Resolution No. 2000-806

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the following Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-123U-05 is **APPROVED (7-0)**:

This property falls within the Subarea 5 Plan's Residential Medium (RM) policy calling for preservation of the surrounding residential areas between 4 and 9 units per acre. The Neighborhood Landmark Overlay District (NLOD) is consistent with that policy. By allowing the reuse of a structure within the context of the individual neighborhood, the specific needs of the community in conjunction with those of the actual site and structure can be accommodated through the NLOD without commercial zoning."

2000Z-124U-03
Map 69-8, Part of Parcel 1
Subarea 3 (1998)

District 2 (Black)

A request to change from OR20 to CS district a portion of property abutting the west margin of Clarksville Pike, approximately 285 feet south of West Hamilton Road (6.0 acres), requested by Vincent T. Scalf, owner.

Ms. Regen stated the applicant would like to defer this item.

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

2000Z-127U-03

Map 70-9, Parcels 127 and 128

Subarea 3 (1998)

District 2 (Black)

A request to change from R8 to CL district property at 2205 and 2207 Buena Vista Pike, approximately 62 feet northeast of Cliff Drive (.73 acres), requested by Linda R. Palmer and Loyd R. Spradlin, owners.

Ms. Regen stated staff is recommending disapproval because the rezoning would be inconsistent with the subarea plan policy, there is no unmapped neighborhood commercial, and there is existing commercial limited property available and for sale.

Mr. Loyd Spradlin, owner, stated he wants to put a small cabinet shop in the back and Ms. Palmer wants to put a beauty shop in the front.

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

Resolution No. 2000-807

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the following Zone Change Proposal No. 2000Z-127U-03 is **DISAPPROVED (7-0)**:

These properties fall within the Subarea 3 Plan's Residential Low Medium (RLM) policy calling for residential uses at up to 4 units per acre. The CL district is not consistent with that policy. This request would allow commercial zoning to encroach too far into this residential area and would also consume affordable housing opportunities since there are two homes on these lots. Additionally, there are other existing vacant commercial opportunities in this area."

MANDATORY REFERRALS

2000M-120U-09

Closure of portion of 17th Avenue North

Map 81-15, Parcels 350, 349 and 382

Subarea 8 (1995)

District 20 (Haddox)

A request to close a portion of 17th Avenue North between Heiman and Knowles Streets to permit St. Vincent de Paul to expand its school playground, requested by Barbara L. Estrin of Turner Universal Construction Company, appellant, for St. Vincent de Paul School, owner. (Easements are to be retained). (Deferred from meeting of 10/12/00).

Ms. Regen stated St. Vincent de Paul School wants to close this portion of 17th Avenue North to expand their playground. Staff is recommending disapproval because in this area, 17th is the only opportunity you have to go north.

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

Resolution No. 2000-808

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **DISAPPROVES (7-0)** Proposal No. 2000M-120U-09:

OTHER BUSINESS

2. Request to Rehear Subdivision No. 2000S-188G-06 Max Vinson Property (Revision) at the November 9, 2000 meeting

Councilmember Vic Lineweaver stated that when he held the neighborhood meeting, before this was passed in Council, he had worked everything out with the engineer and property owners so that Morton Mill Road would continue on and not route the traffic through the subdivision. Since that plan has been changed we are asking for a rehearing and public hearing on November 9, 2000.

Mr. Tim Meehan, president of the Riverbend Homeowners Association, also asked the Commission to approve the rehearing.

Ms. Nielson moved and Ms. Oglesby seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to rehear Subdivision No. 2000S-188G-06, Max Vinson Property, on November 9, 2000.

3. Legislative update

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, upon motion made, seconded and passed, the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

Minute Approval:
This 9th day of November, 2000

