

**MINUTES
OF THE
METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION**

Date: June 29, 1995
Time: 1:00 p.m.
Place: Howard Auditorium

Roll Call

Present:

Gilbert N. Smith, Chairman
Jimmy Allen
Arnett Bodenhamer
William Harbison
Janet Jernigan
James Lawson
William Manier
Councilmember Larry McWhirter
Ann Nielson

Absent:

Mayor Philip Bredesen

Also Present:

Executive Office:

T. Jeff Browning, Executive Director and Secretary
Carolyn Perry, Secretary I

Current Planning and Design Division:

Edward Owens, Planning Division Manager
Mitzi Dudley, Planner III
Tom Martin, Planner III
John Bracey, Planner III
Shawn Henry, Planner II
Charles Hiehle, Planning Technician II

Community Plans Division:

Jerry Fawcett, Planning Division Manager
Robert Eadler, Planner II
Cynthia Lehmbeck, Planner II

Others Present:

Jim Armstrong, Public Works

Chairman Smith called the meeting to order.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Mr. Lawson moved and Ms. Jernigan seconded the motion, which was unanimously passed, to adopt the agenda.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEFERRED ITEMS

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

98-73-G Final Plat deferred two weeks by request of the applicant.

Ms. Jernigan moved and Mr. Harbison seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to defer the above matter.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Lawson moved and Mr. Harbison seconded the motion, which was unanimously passed, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of June 15, 1995.

RECOGNITION OF COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Charles Tygard was present to speak in favor of 95M-069U, a road closure, and also asked the Commission to listen to the neighborhood citizens involved in Subdivision Proposal 95S-137U.

ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Nielson moved and Mr. Lawson seconded the motion to adopt the following items on the consent agenda, which carried unanimously.

APPEAL CASES:

Appeal Case No. 95B-109U
Map 95-9, Parcel 61
Subarea 14
District 15

A request for a conditional use permit under the provisions of Section 17.124.360 (Floodplain) as required by Section 17.116.030 to construct a new 27,750 square foot addition within the IR District, on property located on the north margin of Massman Drive and Acorn Drive (16.58 acres), requested by Eva Hobbs, for Gibson Guitar Corporation, appellant/owner.

Resolution No. 95-484

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Metropolitan Planning Commission offers the following recommendation for Appeal Case No. 95B-109U to the Board of Zoning Appeals:

The site plan complies with the conditional use criteria."

Appeal Case No. 95B-117U
Map 71-14, Parcel 398

Subarea 3
District 5

A request for a conditional use permit under the provisions of Section 17.124.360 (Floodplain) as required by Section 17.116.030 to construct a 12,932 square foot wholesale produce facility within the CG District, on property located on the west margin of Vashti Street, approximately 200 feet south of Baptist World Center Drive (3.64 acres), requested by W. H. Barton, for Paul Fey, appellant, W. L. Davis, owner.

Resolution No. 95-485

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Metropolitan Planning Commission offers the following recommendation for Appeal Case No. 95B-117U to the Board of Zoning Appeals:

The site plan complies with the conditional use criteria. The Board is advised of the Subarea 3 Plan's proposed realignment of Baptist World Center Drive."

Zone Change Proposals:

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-075G
Map 114, Parcels 204 and 215
Subarea 6
District 23

A request to change from CH District to CS District certain property abutting the northeast corner of Old Hickory Boulevard and Tolbert Road (1.11 acres), requested by Bill Anderson, for William M. Judd, et ux, owners.

Resolution No. 95-486

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-075G is **APPROVED**.

The Subarea 6 Plan recommends 'commercial retail' policy for this area, which the requested CS district will implement."

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-076U
Map 70-8, Parcel 153
Subarea 3
District 5

A request to change from R6 District to CS District certain property abutting the south margin of Trinity Lane, approximately 150 feet east of Free Silver Road (.24 acres), requested by Anna Marie Webb.

Resolution No. 95-487

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-076U is **APPROVED**.

The Subarea 3 plan recommends that a concentration of community oriented commercial retail policy be implemented in this area, which the CS district will do. Abutting properties to the east (along the south margin of Trinity Lane) would also be appropriate for CS zoning."

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-077U
Map 60-2, Parcel 284

Subarea 2
District 2

A request to change from R8 District to CS District certain property abutting the south margin of Ewing Drive, approximately 500 feet east of Brick Church Pike (.52 acres), requested by Yolanda Howard, Marvin Berry, owner.

Resolution No. 95-488

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-077U is **APPROVED**.

The Subarea 2 plan applies 'commercial mixed concentration' policy to this general area. The CS district is appropriate to implement this policy."

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-078U
Council Bill No. O95-1508
Map 69, Part of Parcels 50 and 94
Subarea 3
District 1

A request to change from R15 District to CH District certain property abutting the southwest corner of Ashland City Highway and Industrial Parkway and the southwest corner of Ashland City Highway and Jordonia Station Road (approximately 7 acres), requested by Bill Acree, for David C. Allen and Lisa K. A. Creasey.

Resolution No. 95-489

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-078U is **APPROVED**.

The Subarea 3 Plan recommends 'commercial mixed concentration' policy around the Briley Parkway interchange. The CH district is appropriate to implement this policy classification. "

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-081U
Council Bill No. O95-1502
Map 102-8, Parcels 4 and 114
Subarea 7
District 22

A request to change from CS District to OP District certain property abutting the northwest margin of Charlotte Pike, approximately 520 feet northeast of Old Hickory Boulevard (4.94 acres), requested by Edwards and Hotchkiss Architects, for Ulax Estates, Inc., owner.

Resolution No. 95-490

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-081U is **APPROVED**.

The Subarea 7 plan recommends "residential medium-high" policy for this area. The OP district will allow for multi-family residential development and would implement the goals of the plan better than the existing CS district."

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICTS:

District Applications and Finals:

Proposal No. 98-73-G
Hickory Hills Commercial
Map 40, Part of Parcel 36
Subarea 3
District 11

A request for final approval for Phase 7 of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the northwest corner of Old Hickory Boulevard and Hickory Hills Boulevard (3.86 acres), to permit the development of a 30,240 square foot office distribution center facility, requested by TRC International LTD., for, MTA Distributors, owner. **(Final plat approval was deferred).**

Resolution No. 95-491

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 98-73-G is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL PUD APPROVAL**. The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of approval from the Stormwater Management and Traffic Engineering sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. Receipt of detention plans revised to meet the standards of the Stormwater Management Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
3. Recording of a final plat of subdivision and posting of bonds as may be required for public improvements.
4. Receipt of roadway construction plans for the left turn lane on Old Hickory Boulevard revised to meet the standards of the Metropolitan Traffic Engineer.
5. Written confirmation of approval by the Department of Transportation for the roadway construction plans for the left turn lane on Old Hickory Boulevard.
6. By this phased approval, the developer agrees to place into a non-interest bearing escrow fund the pro-rata share of all costs associated with the design and installation of traffic signals at Old Hickory Boulevard and Hickory Hills Drive. Prior to the recording of a plat creating a building site or the issuance of any building permit for this phase, the applicant shall deposit the sum of \$6,000, representing 15% of a total cost estimate of \$40,000. Subsequent phases (if any) shall also make pro-rata contributions to this traffic signal fund until the scope of developments results in meeting the warrants for installation. The use of associated funds shall be limited to the costs associated with the traffic signal, and shall be refunded in full (without interest) if warrants are not met following completion of all phased development.
7. Revised plans which show correct tabular data for building setbacks.”

Request to Revise/Amend a Site Development Plan:

Proposal No. 18-84-U
Burton Hills (Cherry Glen)
Map 131-6-A, Parcels 16 and 19

Subarea 10
District 33

A request to revise the approved preliminary site development plan for the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the west margin of Compton Trace, south of Longview Way, classified R15 and R40, to permit the development of 95 single family lots (currently approved for 141 townhouses), requested by Gresham, Smith and Partners, for Spiva-Hill Investments, owner.

Resolution No. 95-492

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 18-84-U is given **CONDITIONAL PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**. The following conditions apply:

1. Receipt of written confirmation of approval from the Stormwater Management and Traffic Engineering sections of the Department of Public Works.
2. Recording of a final plat of subdivision and the posting of bonds which may be necessary for any required public improvements.”

Proposal No. 74-74-U
Woodlea Place, Phase 2
Map 147-7-A, Parcel 55
Subarea 12
District 30

A request to revise the approved preliminary site development plan of the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the south margin of Edmonson Pike, 900 feet west of Nolensville Pike, to permit the development of a 14 unit residential complex (existing approval for 16 units), requested by Anderson-Delk and Associates, for Radnor Development Corporation, owner.

Resolution No. 95-493

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 74-74-U is given **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL FOR A REVISION TO THE PRELIMINARY MASTER PLAN**. The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of preliminary approval from the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. Any subsequent request for final approval shall include a detention plan approved by the Stormwater Management Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works or provide for downstream improvements to comply with the Stormwater Management Ordinance.”

Proposal No. 232-84-G
Brentwood Place Apartments
Map 161, Parcel 224
Subarea 12
District 32

A request to revise the approved preliminary site development plan and for final approval of the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the northwest margin of Oakley Drive, to permit the development of a 360 unit residential complex (existing approval for 438 units), requested by Gresham, Smith, and Partners, for The Morgan Group, owner.

Resolution No. 95-494

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 232-84-G is given **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF A REVISION TO PRELIMINARY AND FINAL FOR A PHASE.** The following conditions apply:

1. Written confirmation of final approval from the Stormwater Management Section and the Traffic Engineering Section of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.
2. Prior to the issuing of any building permits a payment of \$20,866.00 Dollars must be made to the Metropolitan Government for the reimbursement cost of the existing Traffic Signal at the intersection of Edmonson Pike and McMurray Drive.”

Proposal No. 84-87-P
Holiday Inn - Hickory Hollow
Map 163, Parcel 363
Subarea 13
District 29

A request to revise the approved final site development plan for a phase of the Commercial (General) Planned Unit Development District abutting the southwest quadrant of Crossings Boulevard and Crossings Place, to permit the development of a 139 unit motel, requested by Walter Davidson and Associates, for Mr. C. B. Harbour, III, owner.

Resolution No. 95-495

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 84-87-P is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL FOR A PHASE.** The following condition applies:

1. Written confirmation of approval from the Stormwater Management and Traffic Engineering Sections of the Metropolitan Department of Public Works.”

Proposal No. 89P-003G
Still Spring Hollow, Section 3
Map 142, Part of Parcel 305
Subarea 6
District 35

A request to revise the approved final site development plan and for final approval for Phase 1, Section 3 of the Residential Planned Unit Development District abutting the east margin of Hicks Road, approximately 1,500 feet north of the Memphis-Bristol Highway, to permit the development of 16 single-family lots, requested by Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., for Middle Tennessee Development Partnership, owner. **(Also requesting final plat approval).**

Resolution No. 95-496

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Proposal No. 89P-003G is given **CONDITIONAL FINAL PUD APPROVAL, FINAL PLAT APPROVAL SUBJECT TO POSTING A BOND IN THE AMOUNT OF \$227,015.00.** The following conditions apply:

1. Receipt of revised road construction and drainage plans which adjust the grades of the intersections of the two streets and the location of the inlet structures in a manner acceptable to the Metropolitan Traffic Engineer and the Stormwater Management Section of Public Works.

- Recording of the final plat and posting of the bonds necessary for public improvements.”

SUBDIVISIONS:

Final Plats:

Subdivision No. 41-85-P
Cedar Crest, Phase Two
Map 114, Parcels 145 and 307
(Subarea 6)
(23rd District)

A request to create 43 lots abutting the south terminus of Cedar Crest Drive, approximately 140 feet south of Williams Court (8.24 acres), classified within the R15 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Joe D. Gower, owner/developer, Thomas, Miller and Partners, surveyor. **(Deferred from meeting of 06/15/95).**

Resolution No. 95-497

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 41-85-P, be **APPROVED** subject to posting a performance bond in the amount of \$145,000.00.”

Subdivision No. 94S-124G
Northview Acres, Section One
Map 33-14, Parcels 97 and 102
Map 42, Part of Parcel 22
Subarea 3
District 11

A request to create four lots abutting the south margin of Nella Drive and the south terminus of Green Acres Drive (2.56 acres), classified within the R20 District, requested by Northview D.E.V.P.T. Inc., owner/developer, Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 95-498

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 94S-124G, be **APPROVED** subject to posting a performance bond in the amount of \$59,000.00.”

Subdivision No. 95S-162U
Shoney’s and Lee’s, Lebanon Pike
Map 95-4, Parcel 187
Subarea 14
14th District

A request to subdivide one lot into three lots abutting the south margin of Lebanon Pike, approximately 140 feet west of Bluefield Avenue (1.92 acres), classified within the CS District, requested by Shoney’s, Inc., owner/developer, T. G. Penney, surveyor.

Resolution No. 95-499

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 95S-162U be **APPROVED.**”

Subdivision No. 95S-166U
Royal Park Business Center, Lot 11
Map 107, Part of Parcel 12.2
Subarea 4
District 14

A request to dedicate a street and create a lot abutting the northwest margin of Rachel Drive, opposite Shacklett Drive (5.0 acres), classified within the CG District, requested by Royal Park Investments, L.P., owner/developer, Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No.95-500

“**BE IT RESOLVED** by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 95S-166U be **APPROVED** subject to posting a performance bond in the amount of \$172,500.00.”

Subdivision No. 95S-164G
Northside Festival
Map 26-15, Parcels 3, 4 and 39
Subarea 4
District 10

A request to consolidate three lots into two lots abutting the southwest corner of Gallatin Pike and Northside Drive (10.6 acres), classified within the R6, R20 and Commercial Planned Unit Development Districts, requested by J. L. Newman et ux, et al, owners/developers, CESP, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 95-501

“**BE IT RESOLVED** by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 95S-164G, be **APPROVED** subject to posting a performance bond in the amount of \$161,200.00.”

Subdivision No. 95S-168U
David Lipscomb University
Map 117-16, Parcels 106, 122-125, 139, 140 and 163
Subarea 10
District 25

A request to consolidate eight lots and an abandoned street with the main campus of David Lipscomb University abutting the south termini of Mayfair Avenue (46.6 acres), classified within the R10 District, requested by David Lipscomb University, owner/developer, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 95-502

“**BE IT RESOLVED** by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 95S-168U, be **APPROVED** conditioned upon the Metropolitan Council’s approving an ordinance that abandons a portion of Ferndale Avenue.”

Subdivision No. 95S-171U
Thompson and Ring’s Edenwold Park,
Resubdivision of Lots 241-244
Map 118-8, Parcels 173 and 174
Subarea 11
District 26

A request to consolidate four lots into two lots and dedicating railroad right-of-way abutting the west margin of Eugenia Avenue, approximately 250 feet north of Cruzen Street (.72 acres), classified within the CG District, requested by L & N Investment Corporation, owner/developer, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 95-503

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 95S-171U, be **APPROVED.**”

Subdivision No. 9-87-P
River Plantation, Phase 2B, Section 10
Map 142, Part of Parcel 124
Subarea 35
35th District

A request to dedicate public utility easements within a residential condominium phase located approximately 229 feet west of Sawyer Brown Road, approximately 915 feet south of Gen. George Patton Road (3.89 acres), classified within the R15 Residential Planned Unit Development District, requested by Haurly & Smith Contractors, Inc., owner/developer, Ragan-Smith Associates, Inc. , surveyor.

Resolution No. 95-504

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 9-87-P be **APPROVED** subject to posting a performance bond in the amount of \$82,000.00.”

Subdivision No. 85-85-P
Brentwood Commons (2nd Revision)
Map 160, Parcel 211
Subarea 12
District 32

A request to dedicate street rights-of-way within a commercial subdivision abutting the north margin of Old Hickory Boulevard, approximately 800 feet east of Franklin Pike Circle, classified within the R20 and R40 Commercial Planned Unit Development Districts, requested by American General Life and Accident Insurance Company, owner/developer, Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc., surveyor.

Resolution No. 95-505

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 85-85-P be **APPROVED** subject to posting a performance bond in the amount of \$163,500.00.”

Request for Bond Extension:

Performance Bond No. 89BD-006
Haywood Oaks
Duke Construction Management, Inc., principal
(Request received 06/01/95)

Located at the south terminus of Linbar Drive.

Resolution No. 95-506

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for an extension of Performance Bond No. 89BD-006, Haywood Oaks, until October 1, 1995, as requested, in the full amount of \$15,000.00, said approval being contingent upon submittal of a letter by **July 31, 1995** from the American Motorist Insurance Company agreeing to the extension. **Failure of principal to provide amended security documents shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**"

Performance Bond No. 93BD-076
Harborview, Phase One-A, Section Six
B & P Developments, Inc., principal

Located abutting the northeast terminus of Harborwood Circle, approximately 100 feet northeast of Timber Valley Drive.

Resolution No. 95-507

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for an extension of Performance Bond No. 93BD-076, Harborview, Phase One-A, Section Six until October 1, 1995, in the full amount of \$28,500.00, as requested."

Performance Bond No. 94BD-023
Bell Crest, Section One
William L. Rudolph, principal

Located abutting the east margin of Hickory Park Drive, approximately 75 feet south of Hickory Court Park East.

Resolution No. 95-508

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for an extension of Performance Bond No. 94BD-023, Bell Crest, Section One, until October 1, 1995, as requested, said approval being contingent upon posting an amended letter of credit in the full amount of \$102,000.00 by **July 31, 1995** and extending the expiration date to April 1, 1996. **Failure of principal to provide amended security documents shall be grounds for collection without further notification.**"

Request for Bond Release:

Performance Bond No. 87BD-036
Fredericksburg, Section One-B
Radnor Homes, Inc., principal

Located on both margins of Fredericksburg Way East, approximately 80 feet north of Potomac Lane.

Resolution No. 95-509

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of Performance Bond No. 87BD-036, Fredericksburg, Section One-B, in the amount of \$42,000.00, as requested."

Performance Bond No. 88BD-017
Somerset, Phase Three
Phillips Builders, Inc., principal

Located at the east terminus of Seasons Drive.

Resolution No. 95-510

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of Performance Bond No. 88BD-017, Somerset, Phase Three, in the amount of \$35,400.00, as requested."

Performance Bond No. 92BD-026
Mulberry Downs, Phase One-C
Phillips Builders, Inc., principal

Located abutting the north margin of Mulberry Downs and both margins of Cranapple Cove.

Resolution No. 95-511

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it hereby **APPROVES** the request for release of Performance Bond No. 92BD-026, Mulberry Downs, Phase One-C, in the amount of \$19,000.00, as requested."

MANDATORY REFERRALS:

Proposal No. 95M-065U
Alley 383 Closure
Map 92-16
Subarea 10
19th District

A proposal to close Alley No. 383 between Alley No. 384 and 19th Avenue North, requested by C. B. Harbour, III, for Harco Hospitality of Tennessee, adjacent property owner. (**Easements are to be retained**).

Resolution No. 95-512

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES** Proposal No. 95M-065U."

Proposal No. 95M-066U
Sewer Line and Easement Abandonment
Metropolitan Teachers Apartments, Inc.
Map 117-14, Parcel 172
Subarea 10
District 34

A mandatory referral from the Department of Water Services to abandon approximately 300 feet of sanitary sewer line and easement on property of the Metropolitan Teachers Apartments, Inc., on Hillsboro Circle near Abbott Martin Road.

Resolution No. 95-513

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES** Proposal No. 95M-066U."

Proposal No. 95M-070U

Sewer Line and Easement Abandonment
Inglewood Elementary School
Map 72-11, Parcel 423
Subarea 5
8th District

A mandatory referral from the Department of Water Services to abandon approximately 300 feet of 8 inch sanitary sewer line and easement extending into the Inglewood Elementary School property at Porter and Shinkle Avenues.

Resolution No. 95-514

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **APPROVES** Proposal No. 95M-070U."

This concluded the items on the consent agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Subarea 2 Public Hearing

Consideration of the Subarea 2 Plan

Cynthia Lehmbeck explained that the agenda of the hearing would be as follows: 1) a brief slide presentation to present the process by which the draft plan was developed and explain its key policies; 2) an opportunity for the Planning Commissioners to ask questions about the presentation; 3) the public hearing, during which people would have the opportunity to make comments about the draft plan; and, 4) Planning Commission action on the draft plan.

Introductions

Ms. Lehmbeck read the names of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) members and asked those present to stand. She then thanked them for their time and effort. The Planning Commission also thanked the CAC.

Staff Presentation

The presentation was in the form of a slide show. Ms. Lehmbeck explained the process by which the plan had been developed and summarized its policies. She noted that there had been consistent citizen participation throughout the planning process by people who were not CAC members. She gave particular attention to those areas about which there had been considerable discussion during the planning process. Residential Low Density (RL) policy Area 3C, which is along Springfield Highway, was one of these. The CAC had recommended the application of RL policy to this area even though staff informed them that it did not meet the locational criteria for that policy. RL policy is meant to be applied to only developed areas that have been subdivided at low densities. Area 3C is an undeveloped area with level to rolling terrain that will have sewer infrastructure available during the planning period. Staff recommended the application of RLM policy to this area. The CAC had requested that if the Planning Commission chose to follow staff's recommendation, they include language in the plan that states that the existing character and density of the Graceland Drive subdivision, which is within this area, be preserved. Staff had prepared alternative language for the plan for the Planning Commission to use if it decided to change the area's policy to RLM. The alternative language accommodated the CAC's request.

Another area about which there had been considerable discussion was Residential Medium High Density (RMH) policy Area 6A. This area is adjacent to I-65 south of Ewing Creek. Area residents had attended the public meeting held on May 11. They presented a petition and verbally requested that this area be

included in neighboring Commercial Mixed Concentration (CMC) policy Area 8B. They were concerned about the long-term stability of their area as a single-family residential area and wanted to be able to convert their properties to commercial use. The CAC had agreed with their concerns about the long-term future of the area for single-family use, but did not think it was appropriate to expand the CMC area, particularly because of the lack of need for more commercial development opportunity during the planning period.

The appropriate boundaries for CMC Area 8B, around the Briley Parkway/Brick Church Pike interchange and the Brick Church Pike/Ewing Drive intersection, had also been the subject of considerable discussion. Other boundaries that were the subject of considerable discussion included those of the Industrial and Distribution (IND) policy areas.. Ms. Lehmbeck also explained that the draft plan contained a recommendation to change the planned improvement of Ewing Drive from a mid-to-long-term improvement to a short-term improvement. This was done at the request of the Ewing Drive area residents.

Public Hearing

Councilmember Kwame Leo Lillard complimented the CAC and Planning Commission staff on their hard work and the good job they had done. He asked that the Commission give consideration to the request of the Ewing Drive area residents for CMC policy. He emphasized that these residents needed to stick together as a group if they wished to improve their situation.

Estelle Parker, who owns property on Dickerson Pike near Campbell Road, explained that she had a potential buyer for the parcel who wanted to build mini-warehouses on it. She asked the Planning Commission to change the policy for the property to a category that would allow this to happen. She explained that it was difficult for her to maintain the property because of her age and ill health, and that she wanted to be able to sell it. She did not think that residential use of the area was realistic because there are very few houses in the immediate area.

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

Mr. Harbison mentioned there was only the one conflict between the CAC and staff and suggested the Commission act on the plan at the present time. He agreed with the staff recommendation for RLM policy for Area 3C and suggested the Commission could include the language that would provide protection for the existing homes in the area.

Mr. Lawson said in looking at the development in the area he thought it certainly made sense to plan for densities between two and four dwelling units per acre. He suggested the Commission may want to look at some other kind of compromise that would allow for the retainage of RL in this area for the developed subdivision, and be complemented at slightly higher densities for the surrounding vacant areas.

Ms. Lehmbeck responded it was the more typical practice to apply policies more generally, and to apply the policy that would direct future growth in growth areas such as this one. Since future growth should be at higher densities to make the extension of sewers to the area feasible, it would be more appropriate to apply the higher RLM density more generally, but to protect the character of the existing low density subdivision with language in the plan as suggested by staff. Ms. Lehmbeck stated this procedure had been used in the Parkwood area and two other parts of this same subarea.

Chairman Smith asked if the RLM had been used in the Joelton area.

Ms. Lehmbeck stated that much of the Joelton area that is rough topography was policied for either RL, residential low density policy, or for Conservation, which discouraged development on less than five acres. However, Ms. Lehmbeck stated that the portions of the Joelton area that were found to have level terrain and were accessible to sanitary sewers were policied with higher density RLM. To this extent the practice in both subareas would be consistent to policy Area 3C as RLM.

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

Resolution No. 95-515

“WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Planning Commission created a Citizen Advisory Committee to assist the Commission’s staff in the development of a plan for Subarea 2 consisting of an area in the northern section of the county; and,

WHEREAS, this Citizen Advisory Committee, working in accordance with county-wide General Plan guidelines, developed such a plan in conjunction with the staff of the Metropolitan Planning Commission; and,

WHEREAS, substantial efforts were made to obtain public input into the development of this plan, including a public meeting on May 11, 1995 as well as a public hearing before the Metropolitan Planning Commission on June 29, 1995; and,

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Planning Commission is empowered under state statute and the charter of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County to adopt master or general plans for smaller areas of the county,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Metropolitan Planning Commission hereby **ADOPTS** the *Subarea 2 Plan* (Subarea Plan), including those actions taken by the Planning Commission on June 29, 1995, in accordance with sections 11.504 (e), (j), and 18.02 of the charter of the Metropolitan Planning Commission of Nashville and Davidson County as the basis for the Commission’s development decisions in that area of the county. The *Subarea 2 Plan* is also adopted as part of the General Plan.

APPEAL CASES:

Appeal Case No. 95B-009G
Map 126, Parcel 64
Subarea 6
23rd District

A request for a conditional use permit under the provisions of Section 17.124.330 (sawmills, mining and quarrying activities) as required by Section 17.24.030 to continue use of a quarry operation within the AR2a District, on property located on the southeast corner of the Memphis-Bristol Highway and McCrory Lane (72.24 acres), requested by George Dean, for Hutton Stone, Inc., appellant, W. J. Newsom, owner.

Mr. Henry stated this rock quarry had been in operation since 1975 and is the only rock quarry of the seven in Davidson County that has had to come under the zoning requirements for a permit every five years. All of the other quarries were grandfathered in 1974. This particular site is seeking its fourth five year permit. There is residential zoning and development in the area. Quarry owners have stated they will continue mining but it will be deeper and will not increase the area of the quarry. They have also agreed to provide a berm along the rock crushing portion of the site to serve as a shield between this operation and the residential development in the area.

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

Resolution No. 95-516

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Metropolitan Planning Commission offers the following recommendation for Appeal Case No. 95B-009G to the Board of Zoning Appeals:

The site plan complies with the conditional use criteria, and a five year permit renewal would be appropriate. The Board is advised that new residential construction is occurring in the general area.”

ZONE CHANGE PROPOSALS:

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-069U
Map 61, Part of Parcel 39
Subarea 5
District 4

A request to change from R10 District to IR District certain property abutting the east margin of Ellington Parkway, approximately 2,240 feet south of Ben Allen Road (2.64 acres), requested by Larry Galloway, for AAA Industries, Inc.

Ms. Dudley stated this was an item originally placed on the consent agenda. Councilman Summers had called and expressed some concern regarding the location. The policy in this area applies industrial policy to the area developed industrial and the undeveloped area is commercial mixed concentration. There is specific language in the plan that anticipates flexibility between these two policy categories. There is anticipation that some of the industrial zoning and uses may cross the boundary line as is being proposed with the rezoning. This proposal meets the criteria for allowing expansion set out by the Subarea 5 Plan and staff is recommending approval.

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

Resolution No. 95-517

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-069U is **APPROVED**.

The Subarea 5 Plan places this area on the boundary between ‘commercial mixed concentration’ (CMC) and ‘industrial’ policy. The Plan states that ‘it is intended that light industrial type uses proposed along the edge of the CMC area next to the industrial policy area be considered on their merits. Such uses should not extend significantly into the CMC area, nor interfere with the development of CMC type uses within this area.’

This request does not ‘extend significantly’ into the CMC area. It is an extension of the industrial uses to the south and abuts Ellington Parkway. It will be accessed through and made part of the area within Industrial policy. The Commission does not find anything in this request that would interfere with the bulk of CMC policy area developing in a manner consistent with what that policy intends, including higher density residential uses.”

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-080U
Council Bill No. O95-1501
Map 107-13, Parcel 127
Subarea 11
District 16

A request to change from RM8 District to CS District certain property abutting the north margin of Thompson Place, approximately 400 feet east of Murfreesboro Pike (.63 acres), requested by Robert E. Baker, owner.

Ms. Dudley stated this was the exact same proposal that came before the Commission five years ago and was disapproved. There is a significant topography break between this property and the commercial development along Murfreesboro Road. Thompson Place rises in this location so this area is higher than the commercial area to the south. The Subarea 11 Plan has been adopted since 1990 and it likewise notes the distinction of the areas surrounding Murfreesboro Road and Thompson Place and the area to the east where the multi-family residential area lies. It also suggests that the policy boundary be placed mimicking the existing zoning boundary. Staff feels this site is much more clearly oriented to the residential policy and suggests this request be disapproved.

Mr. Lawson moved and Mr. Harbison seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution.

Resolution No. 95-518

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-080U is **DISAPPROVED**.

The Subarea 11 Plan notes the existing natural transition between the commercial uses clustered around the intersection of Thompson Place and Murfreesboro Road, and the multi-family zoning that begins with this site. The Plan suggests that retail policy be contained within the existing CS zoning district. The Commission found that this site is more related to the residential area than to the commercial corridor along Murfreesboro Pike."

Text Amendment:

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-004T
Council Bill No. O95-1441

A council bill to amend the text of the Zoning Regulations to require that the notification by mail of a zone change public hearing before the Council shall be given twenty-eight (28) days prior to the date of the hearing, which requires amending Section 17.136.070, Subsection A, sponsored by Councilmembers Carney Patterson and Larry McWhirter.

Mr. Henry stated there had been some complaints to Council members that the current fifteen day notification period is not sufficient. Currently any zoning bill before Council will be advertised for public hearing in three ways: newspaper notifications, signs posted on the property, and letters mailed to surrounding property owners 15 days before the public hearing. Mr. Henry stated some county residents do not feel 15 days notice is adequate. This bill would extend that time period for notification to 28 days.

Mr. Henry informed the Commission that, because of the election in August, there would be no public hearing in September. Therefore, the next public hearing would be in November, and it is anticipated it would be one with many proposed zoning bills. Should this ordinance be passed and made effective with the November public hearing, all new zoning bills would have to be introduced into Council on the first Tuesday in October. This would be the first Council meeting in the new term, and the first meeting for all new Council members. Since it might be an imposition to confront council members with a heavy zoning bill deadline at their first Council meeting, Mr. Henry suggested having this bill become effective with the January, 1996 public hearing.

Councilman McWhirter stated he would agree with the effective date of January 1996.

Chairman Smith stated a reluctance to lengthen the process until there were more specific reasons for changing the notification process.

Mr. Browning stated the issue was first raised by a resident near a planned unit development in the Brentwood section of Davidson County. The surrounding residents felt as if the 15 day notice did not provide adequate time to become educated on the issues and to evaluate the development adequately.

Mr. Browning further pointed out to the Planning Commission that efficiency in reviewing and approving zoning matters was probably not going to be achieved by maintaining the shorter 15 day notification period. Greater efficiency was going to be achieved by changing the approval procedures to rely on base zoning more, which would allow administrative review of developments in a shorter period of time once base zoning is applied. Currently, the process requires a more lengthy legislative process both when the base zoning is applied and when the development is proposed as a planned unit development.

Mr. John Stern stated he felt the government should give the community that is effected by zone changes adequate opportunity and notice to participate in the process. The amount of time as it stands now is short, especially if it starts off as a proposal to the Planning Commission. Not only is it desirable to have a longer lead time, but it would also be desirable to increase the radius of notification.

Mr. Pat Emery stated he was a proponent of having full review of developments within the community. He likewise stated the preference of airing the issues as early in the process as possible. Much of this is often done in community meetings that occur before the public hearing. Mr. Emery stated some rezonings are more controversial than others, and it would be preferable to establish procedures commensurate with the concern being expressed by the community. Mr. Emery stated his concern with making an already lengthy process more lengthy if not necessary.

Mr. Bobby Matthews stated he felt the subarea planning process was good for Nashville. He stated that with commercial and industrial developments, the reaction time is the key in the financial world and that it would not be wise to extend the process.

Mr. McWhirter stated one problem with the notification is that only adjoining property owners are notified by mail.

Mr. Lawson agreed and stating that the public notices were buried in the newspaper.

Mr. Bodenhamer moved and Ms. Nielson seconded the motion, to approve the following resolution.

Resolution No. 95-519

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-004T is **APPROVED**.

The Commission recommends that the bill become effective for the January 2, 1996 Council public hearing."

Upon voting the motion carried with seven in favor and Mr. Harbison and Chairman Smith voting no.

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-005T
Council Bill No. O95-1486

A council bill to amend the text of the Zoning Regulations relating to day care centers by removing the authority of the Board of Zoning Appeals to waive the minimum street standards (17.124.070 D), sponsored by Councilmember Jimmy Summers.

Mr. Henry stated that two years ago Council adopted new day care provisions which were intended to bring day care centers out of the center of residential areas and direct them towards the edges of residential neighborhoods, and also to streamline the ability of a day care operator to get a permit in a commercial

district. The key standards adopted for day cares that want to locate in a residential area are a minimum lot size, a minimum street standard and a minimum separation requirement between centers.

Mr. Henry stated these standards may be waived by the Board of Zoning Appeals if it can be shown that the day care center is proposed to be located in an existing public facility such as a school, or church, or similar land use, which already has the capability of generating traffic, and where it may be assumed that issues of traffic capacity, utility capacity and neighborhood compatibility have been resolved. Mr. Henry stated the effect of this bill would be to remove this discretion from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Henry advised the Commission that the specific case with which Mr. Summers is dealing is one in his neighborhood where some sentiment appears to exist on the Board of Zoning Appeals to waive some of these requirements for a proposed day care center. Mr. Henry stated the facility does not qualify as a public building or facility, and therefore is not eligible for the waiver. He stated he had spoken with the zoning administrator, who concurs with his opinion. Given this advisement from staff, Mr. Henry suggested that the case with which Mr. Summers is concerned should not be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals. Likewise, the need for this amendment would vanish.

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

Resolution No. 95-520

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-005T is **DISAPPROVED**.

This bill proposes to remove the discretionary authority from the Board of Zoning Appeals when reviewing day care center locations in residential districts by not allowing a variance of the minimum street standard under special circumstances. An exception to the minimum street standard is an important component of the day care regulations and the Board should be allowed to retain the flexibility to evaluate waiving this standard when specific special circumstances enumerated in the zoning ordinance are found to exist."

Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-006T
Council Bill No. O95-1491

A council bill to amend the text of the Zoning Regulations by eliminating the minimum distance between buildings on the same zone lot (various code sections), sponsored by Councilmember Ronnie Steine.

Mr. Henry stated staff recommended that portions of this bill should be approved, but other portions of it should not be approved. He stated the effect of the bill would be to remove separation requirements between residential buildings on one zone lot. This would pertain particularly to buildings in multi-family residential complexes.

Mr. Henry stated the bill was crafted when a developer was denied permission to construct an apartment building with an eight foot wide breezeway. The Department of Codes Administration apparently interpreted each portion of the building as being separate buildings, even though connected by a common roof, and required that the breezeway be widened to ten feet in order to meet the minimum ten feet of separation between buildings. Staff concurs that requiring building separation in the zoning ordinance in the case of a breezeway is inappropriate. This issue should be dealt with as a building code and fire code issue, and the provisions of this ordinance which would remove the zoning separation requirements in this instance are appropriate.

In the process of writing the amendment, it was crafted to remove all separations between apartment buildings. Staff believes this broad removal of setbacks is inappropriate because there are instances when minimum setbacks between buildings for emergency access, for utility access and maintenance, for

providing adequate light and air, are necessary. For this reason staff recommends disapproval of this bill, and would suggest the Commission indicate its concurrence with an amended or substitute bill which would solve the problem with the breezeway, but would keep other setback requirements in place.

Mr. Harbison inquired about a substitute or amended bill that staff had alluded to.

Mr. Henry stated that Mr. Sonny West from Codes had been talking with Don Jones, Councilman Ronnie Steine and the attorney who originally drafted the bill, and Mr. West had indicated they are currently working on the substitute bill.

Mr. Owens stated that Councilman Steine had indicated to staff that he understands the concerns being raised and is willing to sponsor an amendment to this bill.

Mr. Owens stated staff was recommending disapproval of the bill as currently drafted and recommending an alternative bill which deletes Section 17.28.390 and 17.28.410 and amends 17.28.400.

Ms. Jernigan moved and Mr. Lawson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to approve the following resolution.

Resolution No. 95-521

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Zone Change Proposal No. 95Z-006T is **DISAPPROVED**.

The Commission advises Council that the minimum distance between separate residential buildings on the same lot should be retained in the zoning code (Sections 17.28.380 and 17.68.120). The visual character of the community is influenced by a minimum building separation standard and can enhance fire protection measures. Further, Section 17.28.400 should also be retained, but amended so that the minimum separation between portions of the same building connected by a roofed corridor is regulated by the Metropolitan Building and Fire Codes. A substitute bill which incorporates the above recommendation will be deemed approved by the Metropolitan Planning Commission."

SUBDIVISIONS:

Preliminary Plats:

Subdivision No. 95S-137U
Percy Warner Boulevard Property
Map 129, Parcel 11
(Subarea 7)
(35th District)

A request to create 13 lots abutting the southwest margin of Percy Warner Boulevard, approximately 145 feet northwest of Highland Park Drive (2.94 acres), classified within the R8 District, requested by Joel Wilson, developer, Jewish Community Center, owner, Wamble and Associates, surveyor. **(Deferred from meetings of 06/01/95 and 06/15/95).**

Mr. Bracey stated Mr. Jim Armstrong was present to report for Public Works on this matter.

Mr. Jim Armstrong stated since the last meeting, they had met several times with the area neighbors. Public Works is now recommending approval of this subdivision with a condition that the developer contribute \$5,000 toward a project to reduce flooding impacts downstream to the proposed subdivision. During the meetings the developer had also agreed to provide an additional \$5,000 in contingency to be used if the

drainage improvements and a proposed driveway bridge improvement exceeds the cost anticipated which is \$15,000. Public Works will be proceeding with these improvements as soon as the funds are made available. They have already identified the \$10,000 that Public Works will be providing.

Mr. Joel Wilson, one of the two developers of the property stated that when they entered into the contract with the Community Center, they were not aware of certain problems. He stated they had held two public meetings for the area residents and have come up with solutions to work with the neighborhood. They agreed to help with the flooding expense and have also arranged the driveways so cars would not have to back out onto Percy Warner Boulevard. He stated he felt as a developer he had done everything possible to conform with all regulations.

Mr. Joe Holzmer stated he was one of the most affected by the drainage problem and that he was in favor of the improvements proposed, but expressed concerns regarding whether or not the amount of money is adequate to solve the drainage problem. He also agreed with the developer that the drainage and utility easements should be on the plat.

Mr. Holzmer also pointed out to the Commission that the area being subdivided is zoned differently than the adjoining area where his and other homes are located. Therefore, the density is greater and the lots are smaller on the property being proposed for subdivision. Mr. Holzmer acknowledged that the property owner has the right to subdivide under the prevailing zoning. However, he suggested to the Commission that buffering between the proposed and his existing subdivision would be appropriate, given the differences in zoning and density. Mr. Holzmer stated he had not seen a plat of the subdivision. However, he asked that measures be taken to guarantee an adequate buffer of separation, including maintaining as many existing mature trees as possible.

Mr. Brooks Garland, an area resident who lives on the opposite side of the road from the flooding problem, stated he was against the project and expressed his concerns of flooding reaching his side of the road if the subdivision is built.

Mr. John Crisp stated he was a member of the Subarea 6 CAC. He stated that what the developer is offering is much better than what he could do by way of right and that he would like to insure that the promises the developer has made are followed through with.

Mr. Harbison moved and Mr. Lawson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, to close the public hearing and to approve the following resolution.

Resolution No. 95-522

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that the Plan of Subdivision No. 95S-137U be given **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. The maximum number of lots will not exceed 12.
2. The developer makes a \$5,000.00 contribution plus an additional \$5,000.00 contingency commitment toward drainage mitigation to the Department of Public Works.
3. Driveway locations restricted to paired access points on Percy Warner Boulevard.
4. On-lot turnarounds.
6. 30' minimum front setbacks to be shown on the final plat.
7. Preservation of trees on parent parcel by designation of landscape easements on any final plat.

Final Plats:

Subdivision No. 95S-163U
Capital Hill Homes, Section Two
Map 70-13, Parcel 96
Subarea 3
2nd District

A request to subdivide a lot into two lots abutting the southwest margin of Cliff Drive, approximately 236 feet southeast of Buena Vista Pike (.81 acres), classified within the R8 District, requested by Sammy Lee Burnett, owner/developer, Dale and Associates, Inc., surveyor.

Mr. Bracey stated that in subdividing this property a four to one variance occurs and the applicant is seeking approval with that variance. The lots would be fifty-one and a quarter feet wide by three hundred and forty-five feet deep. There is no consistent pattern of development in this area and staff is recommending approval.

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

Resolution No. 95-523

“BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that Subdivision No. 95S-163U, be **APPROVED** with variance from the 4:1 provisions.”

Proposal No. 95M-069U
(Council Bill No. O95-1456)
Little East Fork Road Closure
Map 178
Subarea 6
District 35

A council bill closing a segment of Little East Fork Road south of State Highway 96. **(Easements are to be retained).**

Ms. Dudley stated staff was recommending disapproval of this bill because it closes only the central portion of a road, thus leaving the two ends as dead end streets, neither of which is proposed to be equipped with adequate turn-arounds. Ms. Dudley stated an amended bill is being discussed with Councilman Tygard which would close a longer segment of the road, and would include dedication of additional right-of-way for a cul-de-sac on the one piece of the road remaining. Ms. Dudley stated this revised closing procedure would provide access to all properties in the area. She stated Public Works concurs with this revised closing procedure.

Councilmember Charles Tygard was in agreement with this proposal, asked the Commission’s disapproval of the current bill, and requested approval of an amended bill as discussed.

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

Resolution No. 95-524

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Metropolitan Planning Commission that it **DISAPPROVES** Proposal No. 95M-069U.

The Commission recommends approval of a substitute bill which closes a larger portion of this road and which will not become effective until a cul-de-sac on the remaining portion of the road is constructed.”

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Visioning.

SYNOPSIS OF COMMENTS ON THE SUBAREA 14 PLAN UPDATE MEETING MADE TO THE MPC ON JUNE 29

Mr. Eadler began by outlining what was intended to be accomplished at the June 22 public meeting: to explain the nature of the land use policy concerns staff had identified prior to the meeting; to elicit from those present any additional Subarea 14 planning concerns that they would like addressed during the update process; and to discuss and establish a schedule of public meetings for the remainder of the update effort.

Mr. Eadler then discussed the primary means of notifying the public about the meeting. He said staff had compiled a mailing list with about 120 addresses within the subarea. In addition, a public notice was published in three newspapers and information about the meeting was put in the branch libraries ahead of the meeting. He noted that staff asked at the meeting (on the sign-in sheets) how people found out about it and, referring to a handout, said that the three main ways people found out about the meeting were (1) newspaper ads, (2) the mailout and (3) word of mouth. He also indicated that people who attended the meeting were added to the mailing list unless they indicated otherwise on the sign-in sheets. He said about 80 people were in attendance at the meeting. Next, he referred to a graphic depicting the geographic location of the addresses of those on the mailing list, and noted that they are dispersed throughout the subarea. He said the mailing list now has about 170 addresses and is growing daily.

Mr. Eadler next summarized how the meeting was conducted: a summary of subarea planning and the update effort was given first; then those in attendance were divided into three groups with each group addressing concerns in one of three different sections of the subarea; and last, the group as a whole discussed the schedule for the remainder of the update.

Mr. Eadler then briefly highlighted the significant concerns raised at the meeting and referred to a map showing the general location of each concern. The concerns were: (1) limited accessibility for the area east of J. Percy Priest Lake that has considerable development potential, (2) growth (versus maintaining the rural character) of the area east of Tulip Grove Road along and between the Chandler Road and Old Lebanon Dirt Road corridors; (3) the types and intensity and serviceability of the “Gateway” area north of Donelson; (4) the inability of the Airport Authority and State Department of Transportation to finalize plans for the extension of Harding Place to I-40 east of the airport; (5) keeping the currently agricultural areas along the Davidson/Wilson county boundary rural between Chandler Road and John Hagar Road; (6) concern about the impacts of the proposed new arterial that would connect McCrory Creek Road and Chandler Road; (7) maintaining the industrial policy in the north part of Hadleys Bend and improving access to this area; (8) traffic congestion on Old Hickory Blvd. and Shute Lane in Hadleys Bend and the apparent engineering constraints to widening Old Hickory Blvd. as called for in the Major Street Plan; (9) the land use policy issues in the Pennington Bend area; (10) the current land use policy along the north side of Lebanon Pike from Donelson Pike to Stones River - desire to do medium density residential development was expressed for this area; (11) the land use policy along the west side of Stewarts Ferry Pike - desire to do office development in this area was expressed; (12) what land use policies to apply to the State property that contains the Tennessee School for the Blind and the Clover Bottom Developmental Center; and (13) the potential land use policies related to possible stops along the rail transit service that may serve the subarea in the future - two stops have been built, one in Donelson Plaza, the other near Chandler Road east of Old Hickory Blvd.

Last, Mr. Eadler indicated that staff suggested for consideration by those in attendance at the June 22 meeting a schedule of meetings in three different locations in July, August and possibly September. He indicated that the vast majority of those present favored having three meetings in July at three different locations, followed by a meeting at each of those locations in August. He said that the need for meetings after August would be discussed and determined at the August meetings. He then closed by asking whether the Planning Commission was comfortable with the schedule, saying that if they were, staff was ready to have a notice of the schedule published next week (week of July 2, 1995).

2. Legislative Update.

Legislative report June 20 and June 27, 1995

Resolutions:

Signs and awnings for O'Charlies, Scarlet Begonia, Zanies, the Hermitage Hotel, and Scooter's Boots were all approved.

On first reading which was the last opportunity for bills to be introduced for the July 11 public hearing, 45 zoning bills were passed. There are a total of 49 bills which are scheduled for the July public hearing.

Second reading:

Councilman Wallace's bill to remove members of boards and commissions after several excused absences was deferred. The Charter was amended in 1991 to allow the council to remove board members or commissioners whenever they want.

The East Bank redevelopment plan was deferred indefinitely.

Third reading:

An alley closure was deferred due to lack of signatures of consent from abutting property owners.

June 27

Council met primarily to pass the Budget, which they did with a vote of 32 to 0. Also passed was an ordinance amending the Metro Employee Benefit System.

Plats Processed Administratively:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 180-83-G | WATERFORD
Plat defines boundary of large open space area. |
| 91P-005U | HOLMAN PROPERTY
Plat creates one lot within commercial PUD. |
| 95S-128G | GEE LANDS
Plat records a deed parcel as a building site. |
| 95S-139G | SOMERSET FARMS, SECTION 2
Plat relocates common line between lots 218 and 219. |
| 95S-158U | CEDARWOOD ESTATES, SECTION 6
Plat consolidates two lots into one. |

95S-176U WOODRIDGE ESTATES
Plat relocates common line between lots 5 and 6.

ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business, upon motion made, seconded and passed, the meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary

Minute Approval:
This 13th day of July 1995