

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

ITEM 17: 2020Z-014TX-001

From: jarrod.smith@gmail.com <jarrod.smith@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 10:59 AM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: Light pollution ordinance

To whom it may concern:

I'm writing in support of the lighting ordinance proposal. Stray/unnecessary light in our communities wastes energy, disrupts wildlife, and prevents current and future generations from enjoying the night sky in the way we used to (even compared to just a few years ago). Furthermore, light pollution does not respect property lines, and has become an outright nuisance in neighborhoods where it's become very common to have neighbors who run incredibly bright outdoor lights all night, beaming bright unwanted light into not only our outdoor living spaces, but also in through living/bedroom windows. I am in favor of taking steps towards using lights in our communities where needed, when needed, but just as importantly, no more than needed.

Sincerely,

Jarrod Smith
7045 Allens Ln
Nashville, TN 37221
615-554-5681

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

ITEM 19a: 2021UD-001-001

Additional Comments

From: James <jamesridley3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 5:21 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: Wedgewood Houston UDO - Deferral

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern regarding the WH / CH UDO. While a significant number of changes have been made since the initial draft was given to us around Christmas we are still concerned with the process and our inability to have a fluid conversation to understand the specific targets and intent.

We have had several question and answer sessions and others have been able to provide a fair amount of critique to which adjustments have been made however there appear still to be a number of vague standards and descriptions and some standards that appear to have unnecessary unintended consequences and as a neighborhood we are not able to sit and digest the most recent draft and talk, as a neighborhood, about the impact of the new language.

As it's related to the process, you - the Commission, are reviewing a draft that was only published this past Friday at the same time or possibly after the Planning Staff's recommendation. We were given a weekend and a few days to read it, discuss it, and respond. This is NOT the road map for a healthy public process. We are asking you to defer indefinitely (at least 30 days) this effort so that we, as a neighborhood can review the latest language and have a thorough discussion with the Councilmember or whoever is providing direction (it's not the neighborhood as far as we can tell) and build consensus on the language.

We think the UDO and zone change are worthy implementation tools. Given this document will create the framework for this neighborhood's future it's important that its language is well thought out and vetted.

From: Amanda Gleaton <agleaton3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 5:54 PM
To: Sledge, Colby (Council Member) <Colby.Sledge@nashville.gov>; Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>; Wedgewood Houston Chestnut Hill UDO (Planning) <whchudo@nashville.gov>
Subject: WH/CH UDO - Deferral

Commissioners -

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

Please accept this email as my expression of concern regarding the WH / CH UDO. While a significant number of changes have been made since the initial draft was given to us around Christmas we are still concerned with the process and our inability to have a fluid conversation to understand the specific targets and intent.

We have had several question and answer sessions and others have been able to provide a fair amount of critique to which adjustments have been made however there appear still to be a number of vague standards and descriptions and some standards that appear to have unnecessary unintended consequences and as a neighborhood we are not able to sit and digest the most recent draft and talk, as a neighborhood, about the impact of the new language.

As it's related to the process, you - the Commission, are reviewing a draft that was only published this past Friday at the same time or possibly after the Planning Staff's recommendation. We were given a weekend and a few days to read it, discuss it, and respond. This is NOT the road map for a healthy public process. We are asking you to defer indefinitely (at least 30 days) this effort so that we, as a neighborhood can review the latest language and have a thorough discussion with the Councilmember or whoever is providing direction (it's not the neighborhood as far as we can tell) and build consensus on the language.

We think the UDO and zone change are worthy implementation tools. Given this document will create the framework for this neighborhood's future it's important that its language is well thought out and vetted.

Amanda Gleaton

615-473-6985

From: Ronnie Lee Booth III <ronnieleebooth@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 6:32 PM

To: Wedgewood Houston Chestnut Hill UDO (Planning) <whchudo@nashville.gov>

Cc: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>; Sledge, Colby (Council Member) <Colby.Sledge@nashville.gov>

Subject: UFO Deferral

I attempted to send this email earlier today, but did not realize until now that it's been in my outbox all day.

In addition to most of my neighborhood, I am not in favor of this bill on many fronts. In my opinion there are plenty of excellent aspects of it, but far more changes the neighbors want to see. On top of the process feeling intentionally rushed, I genuinely don't have any clue why we would place NS zoning anywhere in either of these neighborhoods. Live nation is building a venue here, the soccer stadium is just south of us, we're incredibly close to downtown, and I have never once heard any of my neighbors in Chestnut Hill complain about issues with them. The only beneficiary of that is the hotels and large short term rental complexes that stand to gain substantially from these right and liberties being taken away from property owners. Even given being grandfathered in - homes like mine that were built with the intention to have dedicated space for an Airbnb lose value front that right being stripped away - again only to serve large corporations.

In the document just posted I also didn't see included the 100+ emails from 2/11 that were sent in opposition to the bill. Kicking the can down the road to not have to include these voices is completely unethical.

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

-Ronnie Lee Booth

From: Brian Bandas <Brian@heltonrealestategroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 6:44 AM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: WH/CH UDO

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern regarding the WH / CH UDO. While a significant number of changes have been made since the initial draft was given to us around Christmas, we are still concerned with the process and our inability to have a fluid conversation to understand the specific targets and intent.

We have had several question and answer sessions, and others have been able to provide a fair amount of critique to which adjustments have been made, however there appear still to be a number of vague standards and descriptions and some standards that appear to have unnecessary unintended consequences and as a neighborhood we are not able to sit and digest the most recent draft and talk, as a neighborhood, about the impact of the new language.

As it's related to the process, you - the Commission, are reviewing a draft that was only published this past Friday at the same time or possibly after the Planning Staff's recommendation. We were given a weekend and a few days to read it, discuss it, and respond. This is NOT the road map for a healthy public process. We are asking you to defer indefinitely (at least 60 days) this effort so that we, as a neighborhood can review the latest language and have a thorough discussion with the Councilmember or whoever is providing direction (it's not the neighborhood as far as we can tell) and build consensus on the language.

We think the UDO and zone change are worthy implementation tools. Given this document will create the framework for this neighborhood's future it's important that its language is well thought out and vetted.

Brian Bandas

Anchor Acquisitions, LLC

From: Matthew Hagerty <matt@construct.llc>
Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 8:29 AM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: WH / CH UDO Concerns

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern regarding the WH / CH UDO. While a significant number of changes have been made since the initial draft was given to us around Christmas, we are still concerned with the process and our inability to have a fluid conversation to understand the specific targets and intent.

We have had several question and answer sessions, and others have been able to provide a fair amount of critique to which adjustments have been made, however there appear still to be a number of vague standards and descriptions and some standards that appear to have unnecessary unintended consequences and as a neighborhood we are not able to sit and digest the most recent draft and talk, as a neighborhood, about the impact of the new language.

As it's related to the process, you - the Commission, are reviewing a draft that was only published this past Friday at the same time or possibly after the Planning Staff's recommendation. We were given a weekend and a few days to read it, discuss it, and respond. This is NOT the road map for a healthy public process. We are asking you to defer indefinitely (at least 60 days) this effort so that we, as a neighborhood can review the latest language and have a thorough discussion with the Councilmember or whoever is providing direction (it's not the neighborhood as far as we can tell) and build consensus on the language.

We think the UDO and zone change are worthy implementation tools. Given this document will create the framework for this neighborhood's future it's important that its language is well thought out and vetted.

From: Geoffrey Hamm <geoffrey.hamm@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 2:25 PM

To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>

Subject: UDO Concerns

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern regarding the WH / CH UDO. While a significant number of changes have been made since the initial draft was given to us around Christmas, we are still concerned with the process and our inability to have a fluid conversation to understand the specific targets and intent.

We have had several question and answer sessions, and others have been able to provide a fair amount of critique to which adjustments have been made, however there appear still to be a number of vague standards and descriptions and some standards that appear to have unnecessary unintended

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

consequences and as a neighborhood we are not able to sit and digest the most recent draft and talk, as a neighborhood, about the impact of the new language.

As it's related to the process, you - the Commission, are reviewing a draft that was only published this past Friday at the same time or possibly after the Planning Staff's recommendation. We were given a weekend and a few days to read it, discuss it, and respond. This is NOT the road map for a healthy public process. We are asking you to defer indefinitely (at least 60 days) this effort so that we, as a neighborhood can review the latest language and have a thorough discussion with the Councilmember or whoever is providing direction (it's not the neighborhood as far as we can tell) and build consensus on the language.

We think the UDO and zone change are worthy implementation tools. Given this document will create the framework for this neighborhood's future it's important that its language is well thought out and vetted.

Thanks for your consideration.

Chestnut Hill Resident,

Geoffrey Hamm

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

ITEM 19b: 2021Z-016PR-001

Additional Comments

From: Sean Lewis <sean@matthewspartners.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 4:17 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: My concern

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern for the proposed rezone in Wedgewood Houston, specifically in district 2A (Merrit-Southgate). The planning policy calls for RM40-A in district 2A (see the table below copied from the planning policy that was adopted in 2019). We believe the rezone needs to be adjusted to allow higher density in order create the real world possibility of meeting the planning policy. All SP rezones in 2A over the past 10 years have had higher density than the proposed RM20-A. It all SP rezones in Wedgewood Houston, there is a direct correlation between higher density and construction of mixed housing with smaller more affordable units. The planning policy is very clear about higher density in 2A and RM40-A should be allowed where higher density is called for in the planning policy

Sean Lewis -owner
407 Mallory St
Nashville, Tn 37203
(615)260-3472
Sent from my iPhone

From: Donald Jenkins <donaaldjenkinsnow@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 4:23 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: 2021Z-016PR-001: Zone change

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern for the proposed rezone in Wedgewood Houston, specifically in district 2A (Merrit-Southgate). The planning policy calls for RM40-A in district 2A (see the table below copied from the planning policy that was adopted in 2019). We believe the rezoning needs to be adjusted to allow higher density in order to create the real-world possibility of meeting the planning policy. All SP rezones in 2A over the past 10 years have had a higher density than the proposed RM20-A. In all SP rezones in Wedgewood Houston, there is a direct correlation between higher density and the construction of mixed housing with smaller more affordable units. The planning policy is very clear about higher density in 2A and RM40-A should be allowed where higher density is called for in the planning policy.

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

--

Donald Jenkins

From: Josh Hellmer <hellmerj@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 3:00 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: 2021Z-016PR-001

Please note that we would like all RM20-A NS upzones to change to RM40-A NS, and all OR20 NS zone changes to be removed.

Thanks in advance.

Josh Hellmer
Cream City Development, LLC.
Hummingbird Investments, LLC.
920.207.4721

From: j b <baxter280@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 5:18 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: WH/CH UDO

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern for the proposed rezone in Wedgewood Houston, specifically in district 2A (Merrit-Southgate). The planning policy calls for RM40-A in district 2A (see the table below copied from the planning policy that was adopted in 2019). We believe the rezone needs to be adjusted to allow higher density in order to create the real world possibility of meeting the planning policy. All SP rezones in 2A over the past 10 years have had higher density than the proposed RM20-A. In all SP rezones in Wedgewood Houston, there is a direct correlation between higher density and construction of mixed housing with smaller more affordable units. The planning policy is very clear about higher density in 2A and RM40-A should be allowed where higher density is called for in the planning policy. Sent from my iPhone

From: Lorena Ortega <lolaortega09@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 8:31 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: Wedgewood Houston UDO

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

Commissioners -

Please accept this email as my expression of concern for the proposed rezone in Wedgewood Houston, specifically in district 2A (Merrit-Southgate). The planning policy calls for RM40-A in district 2A (see the table below copied from the planning policy that was adopted in 2019). We believe the rezone needs to be adjusted to allow higher density in order create the real world possibility of meeting the planning policy. All SP rezones in 2A over the past 10 years have had higher density than the proposed RM20-A. It all SP rezones in Wedgewood Houston, there is a direct correlation between higher density and construction of mixed housing with smaller more affordable units. The planning policy is very clear about higher density in 2A and RM40-A should be allowed where higher density is called for in the planning policy.

Lorena O. Suarez

lolaortega09@gmail.com

615-943-4289

Sent from my iPhone

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

ITEM 23: 2020SP-051-001

Additional Comments

From: Gordon Stacy Harmon <stacy@easeuptravel.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 12:13 PM

To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>

Cc: Lewis, Amelia (Planning) <Amelia.Lewis@nashville.gov>; Parker, Sean (Council Member) <Sean.Parker@nashville.gov>; Sean Parker <seanparker@fastmail.fm>

Subject: 2020SP-051-001 - Concerns of neighbors

Good afternoon!

My apologies for not being present in 'person' to express concerns from neighbors of this project.

Since the adoption of the Highland Heights supplemental policy, this is the first higher density SP to impact our neighborhood. While an RM-40 equivalent project would understandably give residents pause, the vast majority of us who live in the neighborhood understand that such dense and intense project need to be and should be located along Dickerson Pike.

Our concerns center around a few significant points -

- 1) Unit count - At several meetings, we've been advised that the unit count would be about 250. The SP application now states 270. While on its face, this may not seem like much of an increase, it does have an impact on building heights, parking, etc.
- 2) Parking - The SP only mentions parking space count dependent on Metro's requirements. But since this project includes a commercial space, there have been no assurances that adequate parking will be provided for a tenant or tenants that might utilize the entire 10,000 square footage listed as the maximum commercial space potential. If the tenant is a restaurant, the requirement is 50 spaces. Depending on the total bedrooms for the 270 units, the parking space count discussed has been 325 spaces plus 30 for the commercial space. How does the applicant intend to adapt spaces should the usage require 50 spaces yet only 30 are dedicated? How is the applicant compensating for visitor spaces for residents?
- 3) Commercial space - there is no plan identified to accommodate delivery trucks to eliminate blocking streets or impeding traffic.
- 4) Rideshare/taxi accommodations - there is no plan to identify spaces to accommodate these transportation options within the property
- 5) ISR - the SP states an ISR of 1.0. Also, there is no stated mediation plan to handle stormwater runoff, no accommodation for retention, etc. With the amount of surface area that will be required for parking, buildings, street and drive pavings, etc., there is no evident means for the small amount of landscaping to handle the same amount of water that the current property does.

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

In short, this SP site plan is quite vague on several issues. While the minimum stated requirements may be acceptable for a number of SP applications, we had hoped and would anticipate a more detailed site plan to alleviate neighbor concerns. It is far easier to address, compromise, and settle these questions before approvals are given instead of trying to solve issues after ground has been broken.

Please defer this application until concerns have been addressed and resolved. Thank you for your time and attention.

Gordon Stacy Harmon, CHS

Your Personal Travel Professional

Ease-Up! Travel Services

(615) JET-SAND (615-538-7263)

This email was generated and sent using 100% electrons

From: Dave Puncochar <dave@goodwoodnashville.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 12:05 PM

To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>

Subject: Fwd: Case No. SP-2020SP-051-001.

Hi Planning Commission,

As property owner of 1307 Dickerson Pike and business owner of Good Wood Nashville, I wanted you to know that I support this project. I hope that this email is not too late to let you know how I feel.

I believe that this development will be good for business, good for our corridor, and good for an improvement of the property it will sit on.

Thank you,

Dave

Case No. SP-2020SP-051-001.

Dave Puncochar, Founder & CEO

Good Wood Nashville

1307 Dickerson Pike

Nashville, TN 37207

615-454-3817 office

www.GoodWoodNashville.com

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Facebook](#) for daily updates.

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

ITEM 24: 2020SP-052-001

Additional Comments

From: Holly Graff <holly@allanfinancial.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 3:54 PM

To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>

Cc: Sledge, Colby (Council Member) <Colby.Sledge@nashville.gov>

Subject: 2020SP-052-001 Pillow+Merritt

Dear Commissioners,

I'm writing regarding the above referenced rezoning application for the properties located at 1321 and 1323 Pillow Street.

As the owner of Unit 204 - 1402 Pillow Street, I would welcome this proposed multi-family residential design in the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration,

Holly Graff

[Allan Financial](#)

Managing Director



p. 604.317.0629

e. holly@allanfinancial.com

w. allanfinancial.com

a. 200-1207 Pacific Blvd, Vancouver, BC V6Z 2R6

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

From: Krishna Patel <krishna1414@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 5:33 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>
Subject: Re: Concerns with for properties 1321 and 1323 Pillow Street

Hello,

I noticed that my email was not included in this document. I would like my concerns to be heard and added to the rest of the document. This is what I originally had emailed the committee:

Dear Metro Nashville Planning Commission,

I am writing with concern for zoning changes for properties 1321 and 1323 Pillow Street. I am not opposed to developments in Wedgewood Houston, but there many issues with the current plan. As a resident on Pillow Street, my skepticism for this proposal is the idea of 39 units on a .46 acre parcel. With the height limit in place, this would easily become one of Wedgewood Houston's most densely populated areas with units of a size uncommon to the area.

Additionally, I strongly discourage the reduction referenced below. I find the .75 space allocation per residential unit unreasonable considering 39 units could result in upwards of 80 people and vehicles.

"The applicant is also utilizing parking reduction allowances that exist in the Zoning Code for proximity to public transit and surrounding sidewalk infrastructure."

My largest concern is parking and safety. Pillow street already functions as a one-way avenue due to the excessive amounts of street parking used by current residents. I would hope one of the conditions imposed would be a requirement of two spots per dwelling with compact spaces limited to a certain percentage of overall volume. Additionally, there is not a lot of usage of public transit around this area. It seems a little unreasonable that a very limited # of parking spots are being offered and it is based on public transit. As a resident in a condo across from the proposed development site with more land and fewer units, it has been difficult to ensure security and safety at our complex.

We have had countless car break-ins, auto theft, and many issues with Animal Control. Adequate lighting, walkability, and a review of all surrounding through-ways to the immediate area should remain paramount in the zoning decision. Let us keep Wedgewood Houston feeling like a community and avoid turning it into a parking lot. I just want to reiterate that I am not against growth, but I would not want to do it at the cost of the current residents.

Thanks,

Krishna

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

From: Amanda Gleaton <agleaton3@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 5:56 PM

To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>; Sledge, Colby (Council Member) <Colby.Sledge@nashville.gov>

Subject: 2020SP-052-001 Pillow+Merritt

Commissioners -

I am writing you to convey my **support** for the SP before you. Case No. 2020SP-052-001 / Pillow+Merritt. I live half a block from the site. I think the development proposal in front of you will positively impact the neighborhood.

Please consider the following:

- The intersection has already experienced similar redevelopment. This SP appears to compliment the new pattern.
- It provides a reasonable and considerate transition between the residential and commercial parts of the neighborhood.
- The plan will extend and vastly improve the sidewalk network.
- The housing types proposed will improve the diversity of the neighborhood, allowing access to folks that might otherwise get priced out. The additional households will be within walking distance of the commercial core of the neighborhood. That additional density will support the viability of local commerce: shops, restaurants and bars.
- The architecture of the building has the potential to create an active and interesting street level experience.
- The number of households (at 39) will not create significant additional vehicular traffic although we have a street network that seems more than adequate to handle it. Specifically, I live on Merritt Avenue and frequently walk Pillow Street at various times during the day and week and find the streets often very quiet.
- The building height appears to compliment the emerging urban pattern in the neighborhood. While the adjacent houses on Pillow are two stories there is a buffer space in between them. Further, a four story building next to a two story house is not an incompatible juxtaposition. That pattern can be found in many vibrant American cities.
- The site plans propose generous additional street parking.
- Street trees proposed will soften the visual experience while contributing to a pleasant pedestrian experience.

As a neighbor I am asking you to support this SP. As always, I appreciate your time and service to our city.

Amanda Gleaton

615-473-6985

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

From: Lexi Cothran <lcothran@sweettalkpr.com>

Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 6:49 PM

To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>

Cc: Sledge, Colby (Council Member) <Colby.Sledge@nashville.gov>; Council Members <CouncilMembers@nashville.gov>

Subject: Wedgewood Houston CASE 2020SP-052-001 - Resident Concerns

To whom it may concern,

I am reaching out regarding the SP zoning changes being proposed for the lots on 1321 + 1323 Pillow Street (Case #2020SP-052-001). I noticed in the comments for this week's meeting that several people submitted their "support" of said zoning change, but the vast majority (if not all) of those people don't live close enough to this potential new build to be directly affected by it. As a resident of Segment (directly across the street at 1402 Pillow Street), I have experienced first-hand the fact that our street is already low on parking – something that these developers clearly haven't looked into, considering the suggestion that this new zoning would allow for only 75% of the number of units to have a parking spot, making up for the rest with "available street parking." Currently, if you attempt to pull onto Pillow from Hamilton, you're essentially entering a one-way street, due to cars consistently parked on both sides – which begs the question: where will the mass overflow from the limited parking at this new complex go? Unfortunately, there is nowhere to accommodate an influx of even a dozen cars from new residents, much less 20-30, which I'm sure would be closer to the actual number of vehicles that would be brought to the area. That being said, this new development needs to accommodate *at least* one spot per unit, as that is a commonplace parking requirement city-wide for multifamily developments. Our street is not made to accommodate a large influx of cars, unless the current residents end up being displaced from their own parking.

From there, another major concern is safety + crime. We've had countless break-ins (and the occasional carjacking) at Segment since November 2019. Just a couple months ago, we had over a dozen cars in our parking lot get their windows bashed in – in one night, alone. If our streets suddenly become parking lots, themselves, we're essentially asking for these acts to continue – and likely worsen.

Lastly, one of the biggest reasons I see that people are in "support" of this new development is because of the "affordable housing options" it would bring to the area. It's important to note that those who are most affected by the lack of affordable housing are typically families and/or single parents with children. Considering these "micro-units" would each be less than 500 sq feet, this is a far cry from what those who are actively seeking out affordable housing would actually need. Therefore, instead of attracting the residents the developers claim to want to appeal to in their proposal, the location would instead attract young professionals. And there's nothing wrong with that demographic, except for the simple fact that they wouldn't have the room to grow in these units, and therefore, would be much less likely to contribute to the bettering of our community, since the neighborhood would only be one thing for them – a temporary home. The last thing we need is for our community to become a revolving door of tenants who don't care about or appreciate our home.

While I understand the desire to build a complex that allows for more residents than the currently allotted amount, the idea of 39 units on a mere .46 acres (in a building that only takes up a little over .2 acres) is outrageous, particularly in this portion of the neighborhood that is more residential and less urbanized. It feels inappropriate for the area and like the perfect way for developers to cash in on a tiny lot + charge an exorbitant amount per square footage, when it's all said and done.

Please, please, please reconsider – and please also confirm this will be added to the agenda comments for this week's meeting, as I've noticed several emails and concerns from those who live in and around Segment are missing from this week's comments list.

Thank you.

Comments on February 25, 2021 MPC Agenda Items

Received through February 24, 2021

Lexi Cothran

615-519-2216

From: Bill Perkins <billp68@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 10:13 AM

To: Planning Commissioners <Planning.Commissioners@nashville.gov>

Subject: Core development corner of Pillow St.and Merritt Ave. in Wedgwood Houston

Commissioners;

I have lived in the Wedgwood Houston neighborhood for 45 years. I support affordable housing. I understand this project will provide affordable units which our neighborhood needs.

Thank you,

Bill Perkins

416 Humphreys St. 37203
