

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON COMMENT FORMS FOR THURSDAY APRIL 3, 2008 CHARLOTTE AVENUE – RICHLAND PARK AREA DESIGN PLAN MEETING #4

As of April 21, 2008, staff had received 8 comment forms, which are summarized below.



RESPONSES ON COMMENT FORMS

Revised Concept Plan and Detailed Land Use Policy Plan (DLUP) Neighborhood Center – West of Morrow Rd. 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 Morrow Rd. Previously, this area extended to the east to 52nd Avenue.

I agree with the revision to the Concept Plan and DLUP for this area. 3 Yes 5 No

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

- I do not want access to my parking lot [5304 Charlotte Ave.] to be restricted in any way. If people have to go down and around to a light they will keep going on to another location that will wipe out my business and I will not be able to pay the exorbitant property taxes.
- I disagree with the plan.
- I-40 access (off-ramp) intersects at 51st Ave. N. Since Alabama Ave. is one-way eastbound, access to the blocks between 52nd and Morrow Rd. is limited. I believe the area was better designated as “Neighborhood Center” as opposed to Auto-Oriented [Commercial]
- 1) Turning four lane into two lane is ridiculous [note: the plan is not recommending this] 2) bike lane is ridiculous 3) stop people from entering businesses from Charlotte-no regard to welfare of merchants involved
- Yes, although like stated before, only if it includes LID technologies; due to the creek sensitive area. I feel 5 stories is too tall and 4 more suitable as maximum story height. I oppose underground parking here and since this is a flood plain, must include green space and low impact development technologies. Currently anything left outside is washed into creek during rain events. I have pictures I can send you.
- Does not need and has not been requested by property owners

Building Regulating Plan Subdistricts

Subdistrict 1. T4 Park and Public Use – Richland Park, the Fire Station and Post Office

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 3 Yes 4 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - Objective 1.2 in Parks Master Plan calls for a Regional Center in Richland Park. Richland Park green space should remain open and any center improvements should occur at existing McCabe Facility
 - nothing
 - just drop it
-

Subdistrict 2. T4 Mixed Use Corridor – Properties fronting on Charlotte Ave.

The Mixed Use Corridor subdistrict calls for 2 – 3 story buildings, built to the sidewalk, with front doors on Charlotte Ave., parking behind or beneath and vehicular access from side streets and alleys. The following building types would be allowed: Mixed Use, Live/Work, Flats and/or Townhouses.

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 3 Yes 5 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - This goal is 15-20 years in the future and requiring it now is going to harm property values to all owners along Charlotte Ave. You have to have car access more than you provide.
 - nothing
 - All individual property owners should be allowed access to their property directly from Charlotte, if there are no side streets or alleys directly connected to the property. These properties should also have more options in commercial usage than the limits being placed on them. This area could bring vital business opportunities to the surrounding neighborhoods.
 - Has any property owner asked for this
-

Subdistrict 3. T4 Neighborhood Center – Properties north of Charlotte Ave. and west of Morrow Rd.

The Neighborhood Center subdistrict calls for 2 – 3 story buildings on Charlotte Ave. and Morrow Rd., up to 5 story buildings interior to the development, built to the sidewalk, with front doors on the primary road, parking behind, beneath or in structures, and vehicular access from side streets and alleys. The following building types would be allowed: Mixed Use, Live/Work, Flats and/or Townhouses.

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 2 Yes 5 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - However, a street connection with traffic signal in-line with 54th Ave. N. should be discouraged without addition of neighborhood traffic calming. A signal at this location would likely draw significant traffic through Sylvan Park.
 - [same as bullet 2 for Subdistrict 2]
 - sounds like you are anti-business in this decision. Imagine parking behind property at night in West Nashville. Good luck on not being robbed or worse
 - Yes, but see 1st question/answer
 - This area should be given the same options listed for subdistrict 2 [bullet 4]
 - Not one property owner has asked for this
-

Subdistrict 4. T4 Commercial Corridor – Properties fronting onto Alabama Ave.

The Commercial Corridor subdistrict calls for 1 – 4 story buildings, allows deeper setbacks with parking in front, behind or beside and vehicular access from Alabama Ave. or side streets. The following building types would be allowed: Auto-Oriented Commercial, Mixed Use, Flats, Courtyard Flats, Townhouses and/or Parking Structures.

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 3 Yes 3 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - nothing
 - Yes, but no underground parking here
 - Not one property owner has asked for this
-

Subdistrict 5. T4 Transition – At 54th, 53rd, 51st, 50th and 46th Avenues

The Transition subdistrict calls for 1 – 3 story buildings, with shallow setbacks mirroring nearby residential setbacks, parking behind or beside, and vehicular access from alleys or side streets. The following building types would be allowed: Mixed Use (with office only), Live/Work (with office only), Flats, Courtyard Flats, Townhouses, Townhouse Courts, Cottages, Cottage Courts and Houses.

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 2 Yes 4 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - nothing
 - The transition area at 53rd seems to be out of line, and should be considered mixed use, along with the connected properties.
 - Not one property owner has asked for this
-

Subdistrict 6. T4 Mixed Housing – On 54th Ave. and at 52nd/ 51st Aves.

The Mixed Housing subdistrict calls for 1 – 3 story residential, with shallow setbacks mirroring nearby residential setbacks, parking behind or beside, and vehicular access from alleys or side streets. The following building types would be allowed: Flats, Courtyard Flats, Townhouses, Townhouse Courts, Cottages, Cottage Courts and Houses.

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 3 Yes 3 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - forget it
 - Yes, but no underground parking and parking should have trees, fence and/or landscaping to hide view from residents (LID) parking area because a flood plain area
 - Not one property owner has asked for this
-

Subdistrict 7. Single Family Detached – At 52nd and Park Ave.

The Single Family Detached subdistrict calls for preservation of the existing single family detached homes. The following building types would be allowed: Cottages and Houses.

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 3 Yes 3 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - nothing
 - Not one property owner has asked for this
-

Subdistrict 8. Creek – Along Richland Creek

The Creek subdistrict calls for the preservation of the floodway and floodplain of Richland Creek.

I agree with the goals and objectives of this subdistrict. 5 Yes 1 No

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

- I disagree with the plan.
 - nothing
 - See previous comments about promoting natural area for migrating and waterfowl habitat
 - If the tax payers in the area agree to pay
-

Additional Thoughts

- How would you like it if someone came to your home uninvited and made a bunch of changes you didn't ask for or need
- I am disappointed that at the last meeting residents did not receive the whole process presented by the Planning Staff due to others present disturbing the meeting. Due to this, some information did not get relayed and I feel I didn't get a good understanding of the BRP. Could there be some review of this and also an introductory announcement at beginning of next meeting to everyone that they cannot disrupt the meeting with irrelevant and angry comments.
- We solved the Sylvan Park issue [ed. conservation zoning overlay] when every property owner had a fair chance to vote on the issue 66% to 33%. Try this and see how it works. I will be glad to pay for postage. Please be fair about this issue. We all know the councilman wants to do a UDO and no one is for it; please put a stop to this.