

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS/ANSWERS AT MONDAY MARCH 3, 2008 CHARLOTTE AVENUE – RICHLAND PARK AREA DESIGN PLAN MEETING #3

This summary includes 1) comments and questions/responses made during the presentation, 2) comments responding to the poster board graphics draft detailed land use plan and transportation plans displayed after the presentation, and 3) comments and responses made on the comment forms handed out at the meeting. As of March 17th, staff had received 11 comment forms.



PRESENTATION-RELATED COMMENTS, QUESTION AND ANSWERS (C: = Comment, Q: = Question, and A: = Answer)

Q: What is the significance of the row of purple dots on the revised concept plan; are they proposed traffic lights?

A: No, they are simply highlighting the most important streets in the study area—Charlotte Avenue being the most important, 46th Ave N and 51st Ave N being of secondary importance and the rest are just local streets

Q: What section was a little higher intensity with restaurants?

A: Area in pink is highest intensity. Yellow area is transition area; mostly for residential, offices and parking but could include some ancillary restaurants that are in office buildings.

Q: What is the policy for St. Ann's?

A: The portion fronting on Charlotte Avenue is "Urban Fabric," which envisions mixed uses with the form and character similar to the "Park District" across Charlotte Avenue from Richland Park. The rear portion is in the "Transition" concept area. This is where a transition in uses and intensity of development is provided between the corridor and Sylvan Park.

C: [We] might want to distinguish the Richland Creek shopping center portion of the "Neighborhood Center" concept area to allow 6 stories, more flexibility [distinguish it from the portion of the "Neighborhood Center" concept area on the east side of Morrow Road.]

Q: When was the last time Charlotte Avenue flooded?

A: Staff did not have a specific answer; no one in the audience could recall a specific year.

Q: What is the transition or buffer area; what does it mean [this refers to the areas designated "TB" on the draft detailed land use plan]?

A: The "TB – Transition or Buffer" detailed land use policy would support a mixture of residential uses, offices, parking and possibly restaurants or other small scale retail uses inside office buildings as ancillary uses. Intensity is intended to be moderate and development would be designed so that uses in this area would be compatible with and have a minimal impact on adjacent residential uses.

Q: What is allowed in "Mixed Use" (MxU) policy? What about auto-related uses?

A: The uses supported by "Mixed Use" policy includes a variety of residential uses; offices, many commercial, institutional, and even small-scale indoor-only industrial uses, what are often called "cottage industries."

- Auto dealerships are not intended in Mixed Use policy and other auto-oriented services are only intended in the "Commercial" area on Alabama Avenue.
- Uses with drive-through facilities are discouraged, particularly along Charlotte Avenue and other streets where pedestrian-friendliness are emphasized
- Existing auto dealerships, auto-oriented uses, and uses with drive-throughs accessing Charlotte would be "grandfathered;" the plan would support these types of uses along Alabama Avenue between 42nd and 52nd Avenues N.

Q: Is there anything in the area designated "Commercial – Com" that would prevent mixed use?

A: The standard definition of "Commercial" does not include residential among the uses it supports. Our intent is to add language in this plan that would allow residential uses in the areas designated "Commercial" so developments that included residential could be considered on their merits. Design of such developments would be important to insure compatibility with adjacent uses because some of the uses allowed in commercial may not be particularly compatible with residential.

C: A large sewer line was built down by the creek a few years ago.

Q: Is parking allowed in the transitional buffer?

A: Parking is one of the uses envisioned in these areas. Zoning would have to be applied that allows parking as the principle use of the property. Most properties designated as “TB” are already zoned OR20 or commercial and both of these districts allow parking as a stand-alone use today.

Q: Can there be brick cross-walks for traffic calming? Does this come from publicly funded money?

A: Yes these can be provided on both Charlotte Avenue and on side streets. The key is finding the funds for such cross-walks. In some areas, these are actually stamped concrete that looks like bricks. An example where this was done is in Madison about 10 years ago at the intersection of Gallatin Pike and Old Hickory Bv. The state funded the portion that normally would have been spent for regular crosswalks and local money was used to fund the additional amount for the brick appearance.

C: Need more detail on speed bumps on 51st and how they would be redesigned to be bicycle-friendly.

Q: How many traffic signals would need to be added on Charlotte with bike lanes?

A: None.

C: Bike lanes on 51st north of Charlotte would be helpful in traffic calming.

Q: How would bike lanes affect on-street parking?

A: They would not impact on-street parking. The plan does not envision eliminating any on-street parking and if there is room for bike lanes, they would be in addition to the parking.

C: Look at bike lanes on Morrow Road. It is fairly wide and there is a large park at the other end of it.

C: People park in the bike lanes along 46th Ave N.

C: Underground parking is unnecessary along Alabama and is an environmental concern [underground water].

A: The plan is not going to mandate underground parking, only accommodate it if someone wants to provide it. The environmental issues would have to be evaluated with any underground parking proposed and could affect whether or not it is feasible at a given location.

QUESTIONS & COMMENTS RELATED TO DISCUSSION AT VEHICLE TRANSPORTATION POSTER BOARD GRAPHIC

Morrow Rd. – One community member suggested bike lanes on Morrow Rd. as at least an interim link, if not permanent complement, for the Richland Creek Greenway north of Charlotte Pk., noting that Morrow Rd. links West Park [a Metro park] to Sylvan Park

Morrow Rd. – A woman asked if the proposed east-west crosswalk at Morrow Rd. & Charlotte Pk. would be dangerous, given existing curb cuts/traffic levels. She also asked if a north-south crosswalk, from north to south side of Charlotte Pk., would be established as well.

Response: A crosswalk upgrade there would likely entail a more comprehensive access management process of consolidating curb-cuts near the intersection, as well as reconstructing and upgrading the sidewalk, etc. there to an urban standard (i.e. curb & gutter, wider than 5')

Charlotte Pk. – Following on the comment above, the problem with Charlotte Pk. & its side streets seems to be *lateral* movement (i.e. crossing Charlotte Pk.), rather than *linear* movement (i.e. walking up and down Charlotte Pk., requiring crossings at side streets).

42nd/Colorado Ave. – This is south of the study area, yet a person who lives there that lives down that way noted that traffic has increased since MBA and other groups now use the athletic fields behind the old textile mill @ 42nd & Charlotte Pk. 42nd is striped as a collector, yet not one on the Collector Street Plan. 51st Ave. south of Charlotte Ave. (the one with speed humps) may have also had collector striping at one time, although it doesn't now. Overall, should both of these streets be identified and upgraded to collectors? 51st & 42nd are both over ¼ mile from 46th, so the collector/arterial “spacing” could possibly be made, although the general standard is a ½ mile between collectors. Metro Planning’s transportation planner will review this.

QUESTIONS & COMMENTS RELATED TO DISCUSSION AT BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN TRANSPORTATION POSTER BOARD GRAPHIC

- Two different individuals raised concern about the potential of a greenway behind their property on Richland Creek. Maintaining access to the creek was given as a reason to not build a greenway trail and the other concerns were about not being aware of existing greenway easements and not wanting general people to have access to the back of their property.
 - Three individuals raised concerns about the proposal to remove speed humps on 51st Avenue. The general consensus on this issue was to not remove the speed humps for bike lanes. They all however said they would support a bike lane on the Northern section of 51st (from Charlotte Avenue to Centennial Blvd).
 - A community resident explained how crossing Charlotte at 42nd avenue for cyclist or pedestrians was often very challenging. Access to TSU via bikeways was pointed out as a need for the area.
-

QUESTIONS & COMMENTS RELATED TO DISCUSSION AT THE DETAILED LAND USE PLAN POSTER BOARD GRAPHICS

There were four copies of this graphic displayed around the room. In the break-out session following the presentation, a few people visited with staff at these four graphics. Staff reported that no specific objections were raised about the draft plan and no specific comments were made about it. Those who spoke just indicated that they liked what staff was doing and liked the plan being developed. One community member asked about how existing uses will be “grand-fathered.” This will be discussed in further detail at the next community meeting.

RESPONSES ON COMMENT FORM

Revised Concept Plan - Neighborhood Center – West of 52nd Ave. and North of Charlotte Ave.

The Revised Concept Plan calls the Neighborhood Center (the most intense area of development) to be limited to the area north of Charlotte Ave. and west of 52nd Ave. Previously, this area included the south side of Charlotte Ave. as well.

I agree with the revision to the Concept Plan for this area. **Yes: (7) No: (1)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- Either concept is acceptable
- I agree to not include the south side of Charlotte Ave
- This area is mostly floodplain—does it not contradict Natural Conservation Policy to intensify development?

Revised Concept Plan – Height of Buildings within Neighborhood Center

The Original Concept Plan called for building heights in Neighborhood Center to be 3 – 6 stories. Planners are now considering building heights of 2 to 4 stories, with the possibility of up to 6 if the developer demonstrates that this meets the intent of the Detailed Corridor Design Plan. What do you think?

I agree with changing the height guidelines to 2 to 4 stories. **Yes: (7) No: (2)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- However, in the shopping center area I would agree up to 6 stories if the plan was detailed enough.
- 3-6 stories seemed appropriate
- Due to soil character and creek sensitivity, development should not exceed the 4 stories. Even with this, I would like to see low impact development and landscaping (green courtyard) utilized here.
- Should not develop this area.

Natural Conservation Policy – Along Richland Creek

Natural Conservation Policy acknowledges current zoning restrictions on development in the floodplain and the creation of the Richland Creek greenway.

I agree with the Natural Conservation Policy for this area. **Yes: (6) No: (5)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- Greenway should not involve private property
- Definitely against any development including development of a greenway along Richland Creek which would go through our property to Charlotte Ave.
- Specifically, any plan or policy that would see the greenway extended north along Richland Creek to Charlotte Ave. on or adjacent to residential property on 54th Ave.
- Key points of a long comment: we don’t see any reason to specifically mention the [Richland Creek] greenway in the plan when it is actually outside of the study area. The greenway extension is the opposite of “Natural Conservation Policy. Richland Creek is stressed . . . constructing a sidewalk next to it and giving more people access to it doesn’t make sense.

Please do not mention the greenway extension in the Charlotte/Richland plan. [*staff clarification—the segment of the planned greenway from I-40 to the southern edge of the study area is in the study area.*]

- I support this but if there is any option to have the greenway run along 54th Ave sidewalks (for this segment only) to encourage wildlife/waterfowl feeding? without disturbance. Since there are multiple bike paths planned too, all pedestrians and bikers will be connected.
- Don't develop a greenway; pavement in a floodplain is development.

Parks Reserves and Civic/Public Benefits Policy – On Richland Park, the Fire Station and Post Office

The DLUP calls for Parks Reserves Policy on Richland Park and Civic/Public Benefit Policy on the fire station and post office. This would limit the use of this land to the existing uses and potentially new park buildings in Richland Park.

I agree with Parks Reserve Policy for Richland Park. **Yes: (8) No: (1)**

I agree with Civic/Public Benefit Policy for the fire station and post office. **Yes: (6) No: (1)**

If “no” to either question, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- If the USPS or Fire Hall were to move, these properties could be incorporated into adjacent uses.
- What types of park buildings? I would like for the park to be mostly green without more buildings.
- No new buildings in Richland Park. Nothing that requires an attendant or maintenance—perhaps a fountain would be okay—but basically leave it GREEN!!!

Mixed Use Policy – Charlotte Ave. and on Alabama Ave. west of 52nd Ave.

The Mixed Use Policy calls for mixed use development – in side-by-side buildings (e.g. a residential building beside an office building, etc.) or “vertically” mixed use, with multiple uses within one building.

I agree with the Mixed Use Policy for this area. **Yes: (9) No: (0)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

Commercial Policy – Along Alabama Ave. east of 52nd Ave.

The Commercial Policy calls for commercial, mixed-use, residential and auto-oriented uses (services for your vehicle and drive through services) along Alabama Ave.

I agree with the Commercial Policy for this area. **Yes: (8) No: (1)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- No vehicle services or drive-through services.

Transition or Buffer Policy – At 46th and Park Ave., 50th and Park Ave. and 53rd and Park Ave.

The Transition or Buffer Policy allows for Residential, Office or Parking in these areas as well as limited retail and restaurant – only as an accessory to an office use. This policy is largely applied to land with non-residential zoning.

I agree with the Transition or Buffer Policy for this area. **Yes: (3) No: (4)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- I do not agree with a parking-only use.
- Would like to see impervious (pervious?) parking; no underground parking.
- What's wrong with restaurants and retail in lower levels of retail here?

Mixed Housing Policy – On 54th Ave. and at 52nd and Park Ave.

The Mixed Housing Policy allows for Residential – single-family, two-family or multi-family – with character compatible with the existing character of the street.

I agree with the Mixed Housing Policy for this area. **Yes: (6) No: (3)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- No two-family or multifamily homes
- Single family only
- I agree with this designation yet would like to see examples. I live on 54th near Charlotte.
- Multifamily is not compatible with existing character

Single Family Detached Policy – At 52nd and Park Ave.

The Single Family Detached Policy allows for single units on single lots.

I agree with the Single Family Detached Policy for this area. **Yes: (8) No: (1)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

Pedestrian Recommendations

The following recommendations are related to pedestrian facilities in the study area:

- Upgrade pedestrian crossing signals to include pedestrian countdown signals at major crossings along corridor.
- Add new east to west crosswalk to intersection of Morrow and Charlotte Ave.
- Create sidewalk/pedestrian bulb-outs at intersections along Charlotte Ave. where on street parking is present.

- Upgrade sidewalks connecting Richland Park to Park Avenue on 48th and 49th to improve ADA accessibility.
- Consolidate access points and parking lots during redevelopment along Charlotte Ave. to improve walkability along the corridor.
- Seek pedestrian easements during redevelopment of area between 53rd and Richland Creek along Charlotte Ave.

I agree with these recommendations. **Yes: (8) No: (2)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- Use sidewalk bulges at cross-walks
- Have different color bricking or concrete at crosswalks
- Add north-south crosswalk across Charlotte at 48th in front of library
- No—run the greenway down 54th via sidewalks to Charlotte
- Add a north-south crosswalk at Charlotte and Morrow
- No, don’t upgrade our sidewalks—build new ones where there aren’t any. Changing grade at intersection is ok, but don’t waste money like you did in front of my house tearing out a sound sidewalk and replacing it.

Bike Recommendations

The following recommendations are related to bicycle facilities in the study area:

- Add bike lanes or shoulders to 51st Ave. and consider removing speed humps that are not conducive to cycling. Narrowed lanes with the addition of bike lanes will help slow traffic.
- Add Share the Road signs on short section of Wyoming. (This is outside of the study area).
- Provide bicycle parking at public and civic uses. New or re-development should provide bicycle parking.

I agree with these recommendations. **Yes: (5) No: (4)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- Do not remove speed bumps totally on 51st
- Add bike lanes on 51st north of Charlotte Avenue and along Morrow Road toward the park
- Keep speed bumps
- Put this info in the context of neighborhood connectivity for bicycle commuting
- Speed humps should remain on 51st
- Do not remove speed humps
- Don’t remove speed bumps; moving them on the sides would encourage motorists to go there
- Yes, but do not remove speed bumps—create divot for bike path lane
- Leave the speed humps on 51st and possibly add them to 53rd with is now a narrow fast track from Charlotte to the Wyoming & 51st intersection
- No, no bike lanes!! leave speed bumps—bicycle parking is fine, but nobody need to ride a bike down Charlotte when they can traverse our section on Park Ave in safety and with scant disruption to traffic.

Transportation Recommendations

The following recommendations are related to mobility and parking in the study area:

- Improve access management (limit and coordinate the number of vehicular entrances and exits) on Charlotte Ave.
- Encourage on-street, parallel parking on side streets throughout the corridor.
- Consider relocating Richland Park parking from one continuous strip to multiple lots in different areas.
- Consider alternate street-cross sections (reallocation of existing pavement) to possibly include turn lanes, some on-street parking and bike lanes.

I agree with these recommendations. **Yes: (6) No: (3)**

If “no”, what would you like to see changed? (Please give concrete direction.)

- I would keep the continuous strip of parking . . . ??? . . .
- Worried that one block narrowed to 3 lanes will create bottlenecks
- Evidence indicates that the “road diet” concept would be inappropriate for traffic volumes on Charlotte Ave (~25,000 vpd)
- No street parking on side streets where residents live—should not be used
- Leave Richland Park parking alone. If there’s a light to cross Charlotte there, that will relieve congestion on Charlotte. Do not put 3 lanes on Charlotte (with one turning lane) between 52nd and 54th. What a mess that would be. Leave it 4 lanes and widen it when the opportunity arises.
- No development of underground parking—they are expensive and damaging to bedrock and aquifers. Also the necessary blasting will disturb existing foundations.
- Synopsis of long comment: has trolley from study area to Downtown been considered; would reduce traffic, pollution; would run along middle lane that would double as a left turn lane [cross-section suggested would be two parking lanes, one through lane in each direction and the center left/trolley lane]; could use alternative fuel; would encourage tourists to the area and boost economic tax base here.
- Yes, except the strip parking on Charlotte is fine as is . . .

- No, leave Richland Park parking alone. It looks good—it works well, providing parking to merchants all along its length even handedly—no bike lanes except one could run down present Richland parking.
-

Additional Thoughts

Synopsis of a long comment:

- I am an environmentalist. Don't tear it down if you can still use it; don't build it if you don't need it.
 - The whole idea of the park is green space and an area for unstructured activity. Volleyball courts aren't used, skeptical of whether shuffleboard, horseshoes, croquet would work; replace pool with fountain, more trees for wildlife habitat
 - Bike Paths: would block traffic and waste more fuel than they save. Not many people ride bikes through town and not many will; bikers use greenways heavily, their fun and good exercise, but the few bikers that would use Charlotte Ave aren't worth sacrificing traffic flow. It would create friction elsewhere between bike paths and on-street parking, which is all many in neighborhood use. Bike paths have no environmental impact
 - You didn't have one recommendation on making the bus more convenient—shelters, benches?
-

Additional thoughts? Include them here or contact Jennifer Carlat (862.7210 or jennifer.carlat@nashville.gov) or Bob Eadler (862.7167 or bob.eadler@nashville.gov)