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# HIGHLAND HEIGHTS CHARRETTE REPORT 

## Introduction

In January 2018, the Metropolitan Planning Commission instructed Planning Department staff to engage residents, property owners, business owners, and other stakeholders in Highland Heights and develop a small area plan to guide future growth for the neighborhood. This instruction followed a three-year period that included more than 43 development proposals presented at Planning Commission.

## Study Boundary

The boundary of the study area was established by the planning team and finalized by the Advisory Committee. As shown in Figure 1, the study area is bounded by Dickerson Pike on the west, Ellington Parkway on the east, Douglas Avenue on the south, and Trinity Lane on the north - all of which is within the East Nashville Community Plan area. East Nashville is one of 14 planning areas employed by the Planning Department to conduct community planning. A larger map (Fig. 3) is shown in the Map Gallery.

## Purpose of Charrette Report

The Charrette Report, which serves as an appendix to the Highland Heights Small Area Plan, accomplishes the following:

- Describes the research and set-up in advance of Charrette Week - observation and issue definition in advance of public meetings, working with advisory committee, etc.
- Documents the participation and input during Charrette Week activities
- Documents the draft policies and designs presented at the Work-inProgress meeting
- Identifies next steps and plan for completion of the study and presentation to the Planning Commission


## Preparation

A successful charrette requires significant, multi-week preparation in advance of Charrette Week. Outreach efforts involve securing meeting locations, lining up stakeholders for individual meetings, and an extensive effort to promote participation throughout the community to ensure


Fig. 1: Highland Heights Study Boundary


Advisory Committee member presenting at Visioning Session

## Metro Planning Provides Small Area Study In Highland Heights

<br>postio: rsimhtars sas



Newschannel 5 coverage of Highland Heights Small Area Plan process


Fig. 2: Census Tract 113 Includes an area slightly larger than the Highland Heights study area
all voices are considered. Research and analysis of a wide-range of data, existing conditions, and evaluation of completed plans begin at least two months prior to Charrette Week. Outreach and analysis of supporting data and plans are summarized in the following pages for the Highland Heights Charrette.

## Outreach

Community engagement is crucial to a successful planning process and plan document, and it requires the use of multiple means of promoting awareness of the project and engagement opportunities for the public. As part of the standard policy amendment process, public notice of the Highland Heights charrette schedule, including community meetings, was mailed to approximately 3,700 property owners within and near the study area. Additional outreach occurred via a website dedicated to the study and flyers for the Advisory Committee members and other stakeholders to share with their contacts and email lists. Advisory Committee members also went door-to-door handing out meeting flyers to most properties in the study area.

Press releases distributed to the Nashville media market also promoted the study and participation opportunities. As an outcome of the media strategy, WTVF-TV 5 (Newschannel 5) joined along for the bus tour with the Advisory Committee and later featured the study during their evening newscasts, which helped get the word out to the community, as well.

Lastly, the planning team met with the District 5 Councilmember and staff from local, regional, and state agencies, including Parks, Public Works, Transit Authority, and Historical Commission. The team also discussed the project with Metro Stormwater and Nashville Electric Service.

## Analysis of Supporting Plans and Data

The following pages describe existing conditions and summarize adopted recommendations from other plans that include Highland Heights. Maps referenced throughout this section are found in the Map Gallery section of the Charrette Report. Fig. 4 shows a photo aerial of the study area.

## Socioeconomic Profile

Census information obtained from the American Community Survey (ACS) of data collected for the 2012-2016 ACS estimates, the latest available for Census Tract level. Data presented is for Census Tract 113 (shown in Figure 2) in Table 1. Census Tract 113 includes area west of Dickerson Pike, north of East Trinity Lane, and east of Ellington Parkway that are outside the Highland Heights study area.

Table 1: Socioeconomic Profile

| Category | Sub-Category | Census Tract $113$ | Davidson County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population | Total, 2016 | 5,620 | 667,885 |
|  | Population, 2010 | 5,169 | 612,884 |
|  | Population Change, 2010-2016 | 8.7\% | 9.0\% |
|  | Average Household Size | 2.7 | 2.4 |
| Race | One race | 97.8\% | 97.7\% |
|  | White | 45.8\% | 63.0\% |
|  | Black or African American | 40.2\% | 27.6\% |
|  | American Indian/ Alaska Native | 0.4\% | 0.3\% |
|  | Asian | 3.0\% | 3.4\% |
|  | Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
|  | Some Other Race | 8.3\% | 3.3\% |
|  | Two or More Races | 2.2\% | 2.3\% |
| Ethnicity | Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) | 21.6\% |  |
| Age | Under 5 years | 10.4\% | 7.0\% |
|  | 5 to 17 years | 13.1\% | 14.6\% |
|  | 18 to 24 years | 7.9\% | 10.4\% |
|  | 25 to 44 years | 34.9\% | 32.9\% |
|  | 45 to 54 years | 9.5\% | 12.6\% |
|  | 55 to 64 years | 12.0\% | 11.5\% |
|  | 65 to 74 years | 8.3\% | 6.4\% |
|  | 75 years and over | 4.0\% | 4.4\% |
|  | Median Age | 34.5 | 34.7 |
| Families | Total (2016) |  |  |
|  | Married Couple Families with Children |  |  |
|  | Single Parent Families with Children |  |  |
|  | Female Householder with Children |  |  |
| Housing Units | Total (2016) | 2,311 | 294,794 |
|  | Occupied | 89.3\% | 91.3\% |
|  | Renter Occupied | 57.7\% | 54.0\% |
|  | Owner Occupied | 42.3\% | 46.0\% |
|  | Vacant | 10.7\% | 8.7\% |
| Tenure | Year Householder Moved into Unit |  |  |
|  | Moved in 2015 or later | 3.5\% | 6.8\% |
|  | Moved 2010 to 2014 | 35.6\% | 41.4\% |
|  | Moved 2000 to 2009 | 30.4\% | 30.3\% |
|  | Moved in 1999 and earlier | 30.5\% | 21.5\% |


| Category | Sub-Category | Census Tract $113$ | Davidson County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Travel | Mean Travel Time to Work (min) | 23.4 | 24.2 |
|  | Workers 16 years and over | 2,684 | 344,577 |
|  | Drove Alone | 70.6\% | 79.5\% |
|  | Carpooled | 22.8\% | 10.0\% |
|  | Public Transportation | 1.6\% | 2.2\% |
|  | Walked or Biked | 0.0\% | 2.2\% |
|  | Other | 1.3\% | 1.0\% |
|  | Worked from home | 5.1\% | 3.7\% |
| Income | Per Capita Income (2016) | \$18,150 | \$30,595 |
|  | Median Income | \$36,304 | \$50,484 |
|  | Mean Income | \$44,914 | \$72,533 |
| Education | Population 25 years and over (2016) | 3,860 | 454,177 |
|  | Less than 9th grade | 13.0\% | 4.9\% |
|  | 9th to 12th grade, No Diploma | 15.4\% | 7.6\% |
|  | High School Graduate (includes equivalency) | 35.0\% | 23.3\% |
|  | Some College, No Degree | 18.2\% | 19.7\% |
|  | Associate's Degree | 2.6\% | 6.3\% |
|  | Bachelor's Degree | 9.0\% | 23.8\% |
|  | Graduate or Professional Degree | 6.8\% | 14.4\% |
|  | Percent high school graduate or higher | 71.6\% | 87.5\% |
|  | Percent bachelor's degree or higher | 15.8\% | 38.2\% |
| Employment Status | Population 16 Years and over (2016) | 4,420 | 536,964 |
|  | In Labor Force | 67.7\% | 70.0\% |
|  | Civilian Labor Force | 67.7\% | 69.9\% |
|  | Employed | 61.8\% | 65.6\% |
|  | Unemployed | 6.0\% | 4.3\% |
|  | Armed Forces | 0.0\% | 0.1\% |
|  | Not in Labor Force <br> nunity Survey, 5-year estimate, 2012-2016 and 2006-201 | 32.3\% | 30.0\% |

## NashvilleNext General Plan

NashvilleNext is a plan created by Nashvillians to guide how and where our community grows through 2040. In 2015, the Planning Commission unanimously adopted NashvilleNext following a three-year community engagement effort that reached over 18,500 participants. The Planning Commission adopted an update to NashvilleNext in 2017.

## Growth and Preservation Concept Map

NashvilleNext's Growth \& Preservation Concept Map presents a countywide vision and serves as tool for aligning spending, regulations, and Metro programs to shape improvements in quality of life so that new development and redevelopment align with community values. Figure 5 shows how this vision is reflected within the study area. Figure 6 shows a wider view of the northeast Nashville area. The Concept Map for Highland Heights illustrates four key factors:

- Neighborhood: represents the bulk of the study area (shown in light yellow) which is primarily an urban residential area offering a mix of housing types and character.
- Transition or Infill: represents the area along East Trinity Lane and off Dickerson Pike (shown in beige) predominantly between Luton Street and Meridian Street and is intended to allow for strategic infill of higher density housing that supports transit lines and activity centers.
- Tier Two Center: represents the area along Dickerson Pike (shown in orange) intended to create a pedestrian-friendly area to accommodate future growth with employment, residences, services, civic uses, retail, and restaurants which receives some investments to manage growth, though less investment than Tier One centers.
- High Capacity Transit Corridor: represents a framework of more intense housing and commercial areas along major roadways with more frequent transit service. Routes that currently support frequent transit service are identified as priority routes. The thick blue line along Dickerson Pike highlights the street as an Immediate Need Priority Corridor for high capacity transit slated for near-term improvements to transit service. The thinner line along East Trinity Lane denotes the street as a Long-term Need Priority Corridor for improvements to transit service.


## Community Character Policy

The Community Character Policy, shown in Figure 7, shows how different Community Character policies link the countywide vision from NashvilleNext to zoning and development decisions for every property in the county. The overarching concept behind each policy is its location within the Transect, a system for categorizing, understanding, and guiding the various development patterns of a region, from the most natural and rural to the most urban. The policies provide guidance for four community elements within each transect category - Open Space, Neighborhoods, Centers, and Corridors.


## nashvillenext

NashvilleNext's Growth and Preservation Concept Map provides an organizing framework for countywide growth

into one of three tiers:

- Tier One: These centers are the focus of coordinated investments to shape growth and support transit service in the next ten years.
- Tier Two: These centers receive some investments to manage growth, though less than Tier One centers.
- Tier Three: These areas are not designated to receive coordinated investments in the next ten-year period to shape demand. Rather, investments may be made to support their current functions, and Metro will work with the private sector to ensure new development and redevelopment support Nashvillians' vision for centers.

Discover more about<br>NashvilleNext online at:<br>http://www.nashville.gov/<br>Government/NashvilleNext.aspx

Discover detailed guidance for each policy area in the Community Character Manual, online at:
http://www.nashville.gov/ Planning-Department/Community-Planning-Design/CCM.aspx

Ten policy areas, predominantly in the T4 Urban Transect, area applied to the study area, as summarized below:

- The majority of the residential neighborhood is designated as $\mathbf{T 4}$

Urban Neighborhood Maintenance (T4 NM), and T4 Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE). T4 NM policy is intended to maintain the character of the urban neighborhood. T4 NE policy is intended to create and enhance the urban neighborhood to include greater housing choice and improved connectivity.

- Small areas of T4 Urban Neighborhood Center (T4 NC) exist along Douglas Avenue and East Trinity Lane. T4 NC policy is intended to maintain, create and enhance urban neighborhood centers that provide daily needs and services for surrounding urban neighborhoods.
- Along Cherokee Avenue and the southeast corner of the study area is T4 Urban Mixed Use Neighborhood (T4 MU) policy. T4 MU is intended to maintain, create, and enhance urban, mixed use neighborhoods with a diverse mix of moderate- to high-density residential, commercial, office, and light industrial land uses.
- There is a small area of T4 Urban Community Center (T4 CC) policy in the southwest corner of the study area. T4 CC is intended to maintain, create, and enhance urban community centers as intense mixed use areas to meet the needs of the larger surrounding area.
- The eastern portion of East Trinity Lane is predominantly in T4 Urban Residential Corridor (T4 RC) policy. T4 RC is intended to maintain, create, and enhance urban residential corridors that support predominantly residential land uses and are compatible with the general character of urban neighborhoods.
- The majority of Dickerson Pike and the western portion of East Trinity Lane is within T4 Urban Mixed Use Corridor (T4 CM) policy. T4 CM is intended to enhance urban mixed use corridors by encouraging a greater mix of higher-density residential and mixed use development.
- Civic (CI) policy is applied to KIPP Nashville school on Douglas Avenue. Civic policy is intended to preserve and enhance publiclyowned properties that are used for civic purposes.
- Conservation (CO) policy is highlighted in the center of the study area and denotes environmentally sensitive land features, primarily stream buffers and a pond.
- Open Space (OS) policy is applied to Tom Joy Park and the associated Head Start Center. Open Space policy is intended to preserve and enhance open space areas.


## Access Nashville

Access Nashville is a comprehensive framework for the city's multimodal transportation network to support Nashville's quality of life and manage growth, development, and preservation through the year 2040 and beyond. Access Nashville provides a coordinated roadmap for the development of the entire transportation network over the next 25 years.

A part of Access Nashville, the Major \& Collector Street Plan (MCSP), shown in Figure 8, is a comprehensive plan and implementation tool for guiding public and private investment in the major streets that make up the backbone of the city's transportation system. Emphasis is placed on designing streets that serve all people and reflect the character of the neighborhoods and centers through which users pass. Therefore, each street segment is categorized under the defining elements of Environment, Street Context, and Functional Design Type and identified with a specific label string comprised of the elements appropriate for that street segment.

The interior of the study area is primarily served by local streets. The streets which form the boundaries of the study area are on the MCSP, as is Lischey Avenue which cuts through the heart of neighborhood.

- Lischey Avenue is categorized as a T4-R-CA2 which is an Urban-Residential-2-lane Collector Avenue.
- Douglas Avenue as T4-M-CA2 which is an Urban-Mixed Use-2-lane Collector Avenue.
- Dickerson Pike as T4-M-AB5-IM which is an Urban-Mixed Use-5-lane Arterial Boulevard-Immediate Need Multimodal Corridor.
- East Trinity Lane has three different categories along the length of the study area.
- T4-M-AB5-LM which is an Urban-Mixed Use-5-lane Arterial Boulevard-Long-Term Need Multimodal Corridor.
- T4-M-AB3-LM which is an Urban-Mixed Use-3-lane Arterial Boulevard-Long-Term Need Multimodal Corridor.
- T4-R-AB3-LM which is an Urban-Residential-3-lane Arterial Boulevard-Long-Term Need Multimodal Corridor.

In addition to MCSP, Access Nashville also identifies walking, bicycling, and street priorities. Among those identified for East Nashville, the following are within the study area:

## Major and Collector Street Plan Symbology

The symbol for each street shown on the Major and Collector Street Plan consists of six characters that are cross-references to sections of text in the Major and Collector Street Plan. Note that one street can have multiple Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) street types along it. The six characters in each symbol represent the following:


Discover more about Access Nashville, online at:

Access Nashville (including MCSP)
http://www.nashville.gov/
Government/NashvilleNext/The-NashvilleNext-Plan.aspx (search for Vol. V)

MCSP classification of streets: https://maps.nashville.gov/MCSP/

- Walking Priorities:
- Dickerson Pike Complete Streets - Study opportunities to implement complete street components with sidewalks, protected bikeways, transit improvements, street crossings, and streetscaping from Douglas Avenue to Briley Parkway. Implement as coordinated capital improvements projects. As redevelopment occurs, consolidate access points to create a limited number of vehicular/pedestrian conflict points.
- Bicycling Priorities
- East Nashville Bikeway - Study the appropriate protected or separated facilities for people biking along Dickerson Pike and Gallatin Pike where roadway right-of-way and buildings constrain the corridors. (See related Walking Project \#14: Dickerson Pike Complete Streets and Walking Project \#15: Gallatin Pike Complete Streets.)
- Trinity Lane Protected Bikeway - Implement a protected bikeway along Trinity Lane from Clarksville Pike to Gallatin Pike.
- Northeast Corridor Preliminary Design - Begin
alternatives study, engineering, and design on the mass transit recommendations from the Nashville Area MPO's Northeast Corridor Mobility Study.


## Walk-n-Bike Recommendations

WalknBike, Nashville's strategic plan for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, bicycle, and pedestrian master plan. Recommendations within the study area, shown in Figures 8 and 9, include:

- North-south neighborway (shared street bikeway type) connections on Meridian Street and Jones Avenue.
- East-west major protected bikeway - bike lanes that are physically separated from traffic - on East Trinity Lane (as shown in Figure 18).
- Dickerson Pike sidewalk - highest priority sidewalk project documented by WalknBike, which aims to provide greater access to public transit.
- Long-term sidewalk needs - identify every street in the neighborhood, remedying the east-west gaps in the existing network as well as the dearth of existing sidewalks east of Jones Avenue.


## nMotion

nMotion proposes Bus Rapid Transit along Dickerson Pike with potential stops in Highland Heights at Douglas Avenue, Gatewood Avenue, and Trinity Lane. Service for the corridor would connect MTA's downtown central station to the Skyline Medical Center area near Dickerson Pike interchange at Briley Parkway. It also includes planned new bus routes along East Trinity Lane that would provide an east-west link between Gallatin Pike and Clarksville Pike, with opportunities for connections with outer routes at various points along the corridor.

## Regulatory

## Zoning

Zoning is the set of rules that govern how land may be used and the development standards for all property within Nashville-Davidson County. Zoning regulations detail how land may be used and developed including: the density, building placement and lot coverage, required parking, and permitted signage. A static zoning map (with zoning changes adopted up until April 1, 2018) is presented in Figure 11. A summary of zoning in the area is described below:

- Neighborhood core is zoned for single and two-family dwellings (R6 and RS7.5) with clusters of commercial and mixed use zoning along Dickerson Pike, East Trinity Lane, and at important intersections along Douglas Avenue.
- Majority of the area is zoned residential, predominantly RS5 which is a medium density single family residential zoning.
- Dickerson Pike is zoned primarily commercial with CS, commercial service zoning, and CL, commercial limited zoning.
- East Trinity Lane continues the CS zoning to the east and also has a significant amount of RM15-A zoning, medium-high density multifamily residential, and RS5.
- Majority of Cherokee Avenue is zoned IWD, Industrial Warehousing/ Distribution, but has seen a significant amount of rezoning to RM20-A, medium-high density multi-family residential, in recent years.
- Southeast corner is zoned IR - Industrial Restrictive.
- Several Specific Plan districts are located throughout the study area primarily for residential development.

Discover more about countywide park and transportation plans online for each of the following:
nMotion:
https://nmotion.info/the-plan-document/nmotion-transit-plan/

WalknBike
http://www.nashville.gov/PublicWorks/WalknBike.aspx

Plan To Play:
http://www.nashville.gov/Parks-and-Recreation/Plan-To-Play.aspx

## Discover more about Zoning Ordinance online at: <br> http://www.nashville.gov/ Planning-Department/RezoningSubdivision.aspx

View Urban Zoning Overlay District Map:
http://maps.nashville.gov/ webimages/MapGallery/PDFMaps/ Urban\%20Zoning\%20District.pdf

Discover more about Skyline Redevelopment District online at: http://www.nashville-mdha.org/ redevelopment-districts/

## Urban Zoning Overlay

Highland Heights sits adjacent to the northern boundary of the Nashville's Urban Zoning Overlay (UZO), a district adopted by Metro Council in 2000 and applied to a large portion of the urban core, based loosely on the 1956 boundary of the City of Nashville. Figure 12 shows the study area in relation to the UZO.

The intent is to preserve and enhance existing development patterns of areas developed prior to the mid-1950s to ensure the compatibility of new development in those older portions of the city. The UZO promotes reinvestment within its boundary by modifying development standards that could add unnecessary expense without improving the safety or compatibility of resulting new development. The UZO also implements provisions of adopted plans that call for particular areas to evolve to a development pattern characterized predominantly by lot sizes, street patterns, and alley systems commonly used before the mid-1950s.

As a zoning overlay, the UZO's application does not change the base zoning or existing entitlements on any property. The standards vary by zoning district, but generally address the placement and size of buildings, amount and location of parking, and landscaping. The UZO is also among the criteria considered when determining sidewalk requirements for new development on streets designated as local by the Major and Collector Street Plan, which is explored further in the Mobility section of this report.

## Skyline Redevelopment District

Nashville's redevelopment districts are established to ensure the use and long-term viability of the urban areas that they encompass. Metropolitan Development and Housing Agency's (MDHA) administration of the districts aims to strategically reverse disinvestment and blight and promote redevelopment that is sustainable from economic, environmental, aesthetic, public safety, and historic preservationist perspectives.

As shown in Figure 13, the Skyline Redevelopment District includes a small portion of the study area located on the northeast corner of Dickerson Pike at Douglas Avenue. The redevelopment plan restricts land uses, provides requirements for landscape treatment, buffering, exterior design, off-street parking, signs, temporary structures/interim uses, vehicular accommodation and service areas, and demolition. New development within the district must gain design approval from MDHA. The plan is in effect until December 31, 2037.

## Development Pattern and Character

## Inventory of Existing Land Use

The Inventory of Existing Land Use provides a generalized view of how land is currently used in the study area, as shown in Figure 14 and summarized in Table 2. Classifications displayed are determined based on information collected by the Property Assessor's Office.

Land use, for the most part, mirrors zoning entitlements in many areas with primarily residential land use within the core, though often at intensities or with grandfathered higher intensity residential uses. Onestory commercial buildings are the primary land use and building type along Dickerson Pike and Trinity Lane. A summary of existing land use is presented below:

- Residential - One Unit (shown in yellow) land uses are the predominate classification of land use, consisting of $59.4 \%$ of the land area in Highland Heights.
- Commercial land uses (shown in red) make up $14.2 \%$ of the neighborhood, but consists primarily of the Holtkamp Greenhouses located in the center of the study area. A variety of auto-oriented commercial land uses along Dickerson Pike, with a number of smaller scale neighborhood commercial uses along East Trinity Lane and Douglas Avenue.
- $11.1 \%$ of the land area is vacant (shown in light green), although a number of these properties have recently been approved primarily for residential development.
- Residential - Two or Three Units land use (shown in orange) is scattered throughout the study area and totals 6.1\%.
- Community, Institutional or Utility (shown in dark green) and Industrial (shown in blue) make up $3.6 \%$ and $3.3 \%$ of the land area respectively.

Analysis of Property Assessor data for various structure characteristics was conducted for the study area. This included exterior, age, and height. Each is described below.

## Age

One component of the built environment is structure age, as measured by year built. More than 1,300 structures are identified by the Property Assessor within the study area. Table 3 summarizes age of structure data in the study area. Figure 15 presents the information in map format. Key highlights of the data include:

Table 2: Existing Land Use

| Use Category | New |
| :--- | ---: |
| Residential - 1 unit | $59.4 \%$ |
| Residential - 2 or 3 unit | $6.1 \%$ |
| Residential - 4+ unit | $0.9 \%$ |
| Residential - Nonhousehold | $0.1 \%$ |
| Community, Institutionial | $3.6 \%$ |
| or Utility |  |
| Office or Medical | $0.7 \%$ |
| Commercial | $14.2 \%$ |
| Auto Parking | $0.3 \%$ |
| Industrial | $3.3 \%$ |
| Vacant or Farm | $11.1 \%$ |
| Use Code Error | $0.3 \%$ |
| Source: Property Assessor |  |

Table 3: Age of Structure

| Year Built <br> Range | Building | $\%$ of <br> Total |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| $1890-1944$ | 511 | $38.2 \%$ |
| $1945-1961$ | 447 | $33.5 \%$ |
| $1962-1983$ | 205 | $15.3 \%$ |
| $1984-2008$ | 108 | $8.1 \%$ |
| $2009-2017$ | 65 | $4.9 \%$ |

Source: Property Assessor

Table 4: Exterior Finish

| Finish | Residential |  | Non-Residential |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bldgs | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Res. } \end{aligned}$ | Bldgs | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { non-Res } \end{gathered}$ |
| Frame | 797 | 66\% | 5 | 6\% |
| Brick | 337 | 28\% | 32 | 35\% |
| Brick/ <br> Frame | 38 | 3\% | 4 | 4\% |
| Concrete <br> Block | 14 | 1\% | 37 | 41\% |
| Stone | 19 | $2 \%$ | 0 | 0\% |
| Stucco | 7 | $1 \%$ | 1 | 1\% |
| Metal | 0 | 0\% | 12 | 8\% |

Source: Property Assessor

- Structures in the study area range in construction date from 1890 to present.
- Approximately $72 \%$ of all structures were built prior to 1962.
- Structures in the 1890-1944 range are scattered throughout the study area, but are most heavily concentrated within the following areas:
- Block defined by Edith Avenue to the north, Douglas Avenue to the south, Lischey Avenue to the west, and Meridian Street to the east.
- Along the east side of Montgomery Avenue between Leroy Street and Ward Street.
- Along the south side of East Trinity Lane between Lischey Avenue and Edwin Street.
- Along the west side of Meridian Street between East Trinity Lane and Edith Avenue.
- Less than 5\% of structures were constructed after 2008.


## Exterior Finish

Another component of the built environment is exterior finish, as measured by the main material used on the exterior of the structure. More than 1,300 structures are identified by the Property Assessor within the study area. Table 4 summarizes exterior finish conditions in the study area, while Figure 16 presents the information in map form. Key highlights of the data include:

- Frame exterior represents more than $65 \%$ of all residential structures.
- Brick represents the second highest used material at $28 \%$.
- Among non-residential buildings, more than $40 \%$ are concrete block and $35 \%$ are brick.


## Height

Another component of the built environment is structure height, as measured by building stories. More than 1,300 structures are identified by the Property Assessor within the study area. Table 5 summarizes structure height conditions in the study area, while Figure 17 presents the information in map form. Key highlights of the data include:

- Residential one to 1.75 stories make up $84 \%$ of all structures.
- Residential two- and three-story account for $9 \%$ of all structures.
- Residential three-story structures are concentrated at northwest corner of intersection at Montgomery Avenue and Douglas Avenue.
- Almost all commercial structures - 87 out of 93 - are one-story.


## Legal Lots of Record

Meridian Street, Stainback Avenue, Pennock Avenue, and Lischey Avenue, shown in Figure 18, contain a system of legal lot lines that have existed since their original platting in the early 1900s. These, now grandfathered, 25 -by- 100 small lots were originally offered to buyers with the intention of combining two or more small lots to form one tax lot (i.e. parcel), meaning that today redevelopment can legally occur on lots that do not meet the minimum lot size requirements for today's base zoning district. This provides an incentive to remove an existing home, which may have been built on two or more original lots, in order to build multiple "skinny" houses. A significant amount of this type of development is occurring where these legal lots of record exist in Highland Heights.

## Parks

One existing Metro park is located in the north-central part of Highland Heights - Tom Joy Park. The park is classified as a neighborhood park by Plan to Play, Nashville's strategic plan for parks and greenways. Shown in Figure 19, the park is located at 1901 Lischey Avenue. It is a small park with a playground, a pavilion, and a big, grassy field around which is a paved walking trail. The park shares a neighborhood block with Tom Joy Head Start Center. The head start center currently occupies two-thirds of the block.

## Development Activity

## Zoning Changes

More than 40 rezoning requests have been adopted by Metro Council for the study area between 2013 and 2018, as shown in Figure 20 and (also see Table 8 next to Figure 20 in the Map Gallery) summarized below:

- 14 Specific Plan (SP) zoning districts approved with a combined potential yield of 484 new residential units - 348 within two SPs (identified on the map as Nos. 36 and 37). The next largest (No. 32), drops down to only 32 units.
- Nine rezones from IWD to RM20-A on Cherokee Avenue.
- 16 rezones to RM15-A and RM20-A (higher density residential).
- Ten rezones from RS5 (and one RS10) to R6 and R6-A.

Table 5: Height

| Number of Stories | Building |
| :--- | :--- | | $\%$ of |
| :---: |
| Total |

Residential Structures

| 1 and 1.25 Stories | 977 | $72.3 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1.5 to 1.75 Stories <br> (including split-level) | 157 | $11.6 \%$ |
| 2 stories | 96 | $7.1 \%$ |
| 3 stories | 28 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Construction Value |  |  |
| 1 Story | 87 | $6.4 \%$ |
| 2 Story | 6 | $0.4 \%$ |

Source: Property Assessor

Discover status of active requests to the Planning Commission using Development Tracker online at: https://maps.nashville.gov/ DevelopmentTracker/

Table 6: Building Permit Activity
Permit
Activity New Addn Rehab

By Building Type

| All Types | 188 | 30 | 101 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Single |  |  |  |
| Family | 151 | 25 | 93 |
| Duplex | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Triplex or <br> Quadplex | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Townhouse | 35 | 0 | 0 |
| Apt $>5$ units | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Accessory | 0 | 4 | 1 |

By Construction Value

| Sum | $\$ 16 \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 806 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 3.1 \mathrm{M}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Minimum | $\$ 77 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 2 \mathrm{~K}$ |
| Maximum | $\$ 281 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 120 \mathrm{~K}$ | $\$ 150 \mathrm{~K}$ |

Source: Property Assessor
Table 7: Cherokee Avenue Summary of Potential Residential Yield

| Use Category | Units |
| :--- | ---: |
| Existing Units (2017) | 19 |
| Units possible with current (2017) <br> zoning | 67 |
| Units possible with rezoning <br> remaining non-residential <br> property to RM9-A | 207 |
| Units possible with rezoning <br> remaining non-residential <br> property to RM15-A | 345 |
| Units possible with rezoning <br> remaining non-residential <br> property to RM20-A | 460 |

## Building Permit Activity

An analysis of residential building permit activity, generated as the Codes Department issues construction permits, revealed additional evidence of a rapidly revitalizing neighborhood. Table 6 summarizes permit activity in the study area, while Figure 21 presents the information in map form.

- Total construction value of all new permits issued from 2013 to March 2018 is $\$ 19.9$ million and includes:
- \$16 million for new construction.
- \$806,000 for building additions.
- \$3.1 million for rehabilitation of existing structures.
- Permits for single family comprised more than $80 \%$ of all new construction permits issued within the study area.


## Cherokee Avenue

Cherokee Avenue is a dead-end street located in the northeast corner of the study area and is currently characterized by a mix of industrial, warehouse, commercial, and residential uses. Since mid-2015, the Planning Commission has processed a number of rezoning requests for properties along Cherokee Avenue, generally with requests for increased residential unit yield. In 2017, planning staff completed a residential unit yield analysis to better understand the overall effect of continued rezoning requests along Cherokee Avenue for increased residential capacity. A summary of staff's analysis of potential residential yield is provided in Table 7.

## Existing Mobility Conditions

## Bikeways

Highland Heights currently has low-stress bikeways - bike facilities considered to be low-stress for the average person - only on Douglas Avenue, as shown in Figure 22.

## Pedestrian

The neighborhood has sidewalks, also shown in Figure 22, on many of the north-south streets - Meridian Street, Pennock Avenue, Stainback Avenue, Lischey Avenue, and Jones Avenue, but lacking comparatively on eastwest streets. Those few that do exist do not make complete connections through the neighborhood. Further, aside from Douglas Avenue and East Trinity Lane, there are currently no sidewalks at all east of Jones Avenue. The study area's location in relation to the Urban Zoning Overlay, and the NashvilleNext Growth and Preservation Concept Map Center, leave several areas without tools needed to require sidewalks with new residential development.

## Public Transit

Three Nashville Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) bus routes, as shown in Figure 23, link the neighborhood to downtown Nashville. In addition, multiple MTA and regional RTA routes use Ellington Parkway without stopping in Highland Heights. Routes that stop in the study area include:

- 23 Dickerson Road, a local service route operating with 20-25 minute frequencies on weekdays and 45 minutes on weekends, links Music City Central station in Downtown Nashville to Skyline Commons Shopping Center located near the Dickerson Pike/Briley Parkway interchange.
- $\mathbf{2 8}$ Meridian, a local service route operating with 30-50 minute frequencies on weekdays and 50 minutes on weekends, links Music City Central station to Highland Heights and includes study area streets Meridian Street and Lischey Street.
- $\mathbf{3 0}$ McFerrin, a local service route operating with weekday (only) frequencies of one hour, linking Music City Central to Oakwood Park and includes study area streets Douglas Avenue, Montgomery Avenue, Chickasaw Avenue, and Jones Avenue.
- 43 Hickory Hills, a local service route operating 10 daily weekday (only) trips, links Music City Central station to Whites Creek High School, via Dickerson Pike within the study area.


## Development Constraints

Development constraints for the study area were identified through analysis of 10 -foot contours, and the location of steep slopes, streams, and a cemetery in the study area is shown in Figure 24. The following provides a summary of development constraints identified in the study area:

- Primary area of steep slopes, identified as slopes between $15 \%-20 \%$, are located in the northeast corner of the study area at East Trinity Lane and Ellington Parkway. Smaller areas of $15 \%-20 \%$ slope are scattered sparsely throughout the study area.
- One stream is identified in the center south of the study area. Another smaller stream runs from Cherokee Avenue to Oneida Avenue.
- Greenhouses property contains a small wetland area and a historic cemetery.


## Historic Resources

Historic Resources in Highland Heights, shown in Figure 23, identify properties that are eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or National Register Eligible (NRE), and those that are Worthy of Conservation (WOC). NRE properties are those that meet all the standards of the National Register but have not been officially listed
with the National Park Service. WOC is a local designation for properties that are historic, but not significant enough to be listed or not eligible for listing in the National Register. The following summarizes historic properties in the study area:

- KIPP Academy Nashville is the only NRE structure within the study area, a 1930s-era structure that was the Highland Heights school.
- Multiple WOC-designated properties, including Holtkamp Greenhouses property (center of study area), residential property along Chickasaw Avenue and Oneida Avenue, a scattering of singlefamily homes, and a few commercial properties predominantly along Dickerson Pike

During preparation of this report, the Metropolitan Historical Commission was in the process of conducting a historic resources survey of the study area. A map of what has been previously identified is shown in Figure 25.

## Community History

Located in popular East Nashville, the Highland Heights neighborhood contains diverse architecture, although most houses were built post-World War II. Today, housing types include small cottages, craftsman houses, and a few early 20th century mansions on large lots, as well as modern houses.

One of the large mansions, the White-Joy Mansion, predates the Civil War. General William White commissioned the house's original foundation in 1818. White was famously shot in a duel with Sam Houston over who would become Nashville's post master general. White survived the gunshot, and, years later, at his death was buried on an adjacent property, where his grave is marked and can be visited today. White sold 100 acres to the Lischey Floral Company, and this site has been prominent as a plant nursery ever since. While successful, the Lischey family sold their business to Tom Joy in 1850. Joy's business expanded rapidly, became the largest violet producer in the country, and he owned greenhouses up and down the east coast. Tom Joy, Jr. bought the Joy Mansion in 1890. In 1895, the Tennessean newspaper covered one of many events being held at Joy's Floral Gardens. In the mid-20th century, the Joy family sold the farm to the Holtkamp family from Germany, and the business is one of the largest violet producers in the world, continuing the greenhouse legacy.

Lischey Nursery and Greenhouses, was established in 1854 by Louis Lischey, who was originally from England. The business was located on the streetcar line on the east side of Lischey and Mile End Avenues. Joseph Browne, who was born into slavery in 1859 and reared in the house of

Louis Lischey, inherited the property after Lischey's death and became the proprietor, selling plants, cut flowers, and floral designs. He continued working until his death in 1917. According to his obituary "He was well thought of and had a large patronage, being especially sought after as a landscape gardener. Of late years he made a specialty of furnishing palms and pot plants for hotel decorations." Mr. Brown and his wife donated \$130,000 to Fisk University. His former homes still stand at 1311 Lischey Avenue and at 501 Douglas Avenue.

By 1908, Nashville's city limits had reached what is now known as Douglas Avenue. Rapid growth occurred as streetcar lines were developed, including a main line along First Street and Dickerson Pike. In 1910, the Tennessean newspaper ran an advertisement for building lots for sale in Trinity Heights, north of Joy's Floral Gardens. In 1913, the Tennessean ran an advertisement for building lots offered for sale in the southern part of the neighborhood - Meridian Street, Stainback Avenue, Pennock Avenue, and Lischey Avenue. At that time, the Meridian Streetcar Line ran up to Evanston Street, approximately two blocks south of Douglas Avenue, although the route mentions Joy's Floral Gardens. When Nashville and Davidson County consolidated into a metropolitan government in 1963, Highland Heights became part of the Urban Services District.

After the storms and tornado destruction in spring of 1998, people realized that the adopted suburban-focused Zoning Code caused design issues for building in urban neighborhoods. In 2000, the Metro Council adopted the Urban Zoning Overlay (UZO), covering the parts of the city developed prior to 1950. The UZO helps older neighborhoods retain their character by protecting existing development patterns, ensuring compatibility of new development, and exempting them from more suburban landscaping and parking requirements. Today, however, the Urban Zoning Overlay boundary stops at Douglas Avenue.

Highland Heights has evolved over the past five years as new houses are being built and new people are moving in. Prior to that, property values and residential development were sluggish, especially during the recession. Currently, as with many urban neighborhoods close to Downtown, residential land and houses are in high demand. With the current rapid pace of redevelopment, rehab, and rising property values, community members are worried about teardowns of original historic homes only to be replaced by new modern housing. In addition, rising property values mean rising property taxes and a higher cost of living for everyone, including long-time residents, senior citizens, and those with low income levels.

## Map Gallery

Figures and tables presented in this section are referenced in the Analysis of Supporting Plans and Data portion of this report.

Fig. 1: Study Area


Fig. 3: Study Area Aerial


Fig. 4: Growth \& Preservation Concept - Study Area


Fig. 5: Growth \& Preservation Concept - Community


Fig. 6: Community Character Policy


Fig. 7: Major \& Collector Street Plan


Fig. 8: Walk-n-Bike - Pedestrian


Fig. 9: Walk-n-Bike - Bicycle


Fig. 10: Existing Zoning


Fig. 11: Urban Zoning Overlay


Fig. 12: Redevelopment Districts


Fig. 13: Existing Land Use


Fig. 14: Age of Structure


Fig. 15: Exterior Finish


Fig. 16: Height of Structure


Fig. 17: Existing Lot Lines and Parcels


Fig. 18: Parks and Open Space


Fig. 19: Rezoning Requests 2013-2018
Issued 2013-2018 (see Table 8 for details of each rezoning)


Table 8: Rezoning Requests

| Map | MPC Case/ Ordinance | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2013Z-038PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2013-617 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20 |
| 2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2013SP-052-001 } \\ \text { BL2013-623 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (1-2 units) |
| 3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2013SP-032-001 } \\ \text { BL2013-627 } \end{gathered}$ | From CL, RS5 to SP (28 units and office |
| 4 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2014Z-004PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2014-713 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to RM15-A |
| 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2014Z-058PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2014-935 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to MUL-A |
| 6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2014SP-080-001 } \\ \text { BL2014-989 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (7 units) |
| 7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015Z-023PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1076 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to RM20-A |
| 8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015SP-034-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1090 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (8 units) |
| 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015SP-019-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1096 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (18 units) |
| 10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015Z-016PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1163 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to R6 |
| 11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015Z-030PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1171 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |
| 12 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015SP-050-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1180 } \end{gathered}$ | Rom RS5 to SP (3 units) |
| 13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015SP-049-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1181 } \end{gathered}$ | From SP to SP (4 units) |
| 14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015Z-037PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-1220 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to RM20-A |
| 15 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015Z-072PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-15 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { From RS5 to } \\ & \text { RM20-A } \end{aligned}$ |
| 16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015SP-077-001 } \\ \text { BL2015-54 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (3 units) |
| 17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015Z-100PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-142 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |
| 18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2015SP-111-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-169 } \end{gathered}$ | From SP to SP (2 units) |
| 19 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-015PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-281 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to MUN-A |
| 20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-012PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-284 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to R6 |
| 21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-065PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-353 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5, CL, CN, IWD to R6-A, MUN-A |
| 22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-086PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-407 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS10 to R6-A |


| Map | MPC Case/ Ordinance | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-068PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-410 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to RM20-A |
| 24 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-099PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-443 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { From SP to } \\ \text { R6-A } \end{gathered}$ |
| 25 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-112PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2016-476 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to R6-A |
| 26 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-112PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-1021 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |
| 27 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-108PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-1024 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |
| 28 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-106PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-1028 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { From RS7.5 to } \\ & \text { RM20-A } \end{aligned}$ |
| 29 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016SP-047-002 } \\ \text { BL2017-631 } \end{gathered}$ | From CN, RS5, SP to SP (16 units, 3,800 sq ft retail/office) |
| 30 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-039PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-766 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to R6-A |
| 31 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017SP-025-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-777 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { From RS5 to } \\ & \mathrm{SP} \end{aligned}$ |
| 32 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017SP-030-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-786 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (32 units) |
| 33 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-070PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-843 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |
| 34 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-120PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-849 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to R6 |
| 35 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-052PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-854 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to MUN-A |
| 36 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017SP-066-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-891 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (158 units) |
| 37 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017SP-035-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-918 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (190 units) |
| 38 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-082PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-923 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to R6-A |
| 39 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2016Z-077PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-966 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to R6 |
| 40* | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-121PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2018-1050 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |
| 41* | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017Z-036PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2017-770 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to RM15-A |
| 42* | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2018Z-002PR-001 } \\ \text { BL2018-1089 } \end{gathered}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |
| 43* | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2017SP-074-001 } \\ \text { BL2018-1096 } \end{gathered}$ | From RS5 to SP (13 units) |
| 44* | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2018Z-004PR-001 } \\ & \text { Not Yet Filed } \end{aligned}$ | From IWD to RM20-A |

Fig. 20: Building Permits 2013-2018


Fig. 21: Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities


Fig. 22: Nashville MTA Bus Routes


Fig. 23: Development Constraints


Fig. 24: Historic Resources


## Charrette Week

Community engagement efforts for Highland Heights centered on a four-day charrette in March 2018. A charrette is a collaborative planning and design effort organized to build consensus and focus on one or more common goals. Planning staff worked on location from the East Precinct community room located one block east of the study area on East Trinity Lane. Staff facilitated the Visioning Workshop at Howard Office Building's Sonny West Conference Room.

## Advisory Committee

The planning team developed an Advisory Committee to help steer the study during the early stages of the project. The eight-member committee made up of residents, property owners, neighborhood leaders, and developers met multiple times throughout the process.

## Pre-Charrette Meeting

The planning team convened the first Advisory Committee meeting prior to Charrette Week to introduce them to the process, engage them in early discussions about issues in the community, and discuss preferred outreach.

## Neighborhood Tour

Charrette Week kicked off with a neighborhood bus tour by the Planning Team and Advisory Committee. The tour allowed staff and committee members to discuss existing issues from the community's perspective. Committee members pointed out specific issues that were important to them during the tour. Discussion included pros and cons of recently approved zoning changes. The tour conversation also highlighted an ongoing conversation among points of view that fell into two camps. Some see new, higher intensity growth within the core of the neighborhood as sign of positive change, while others see these changes as a threat to neighborhood character.

## Charrette Progress Meeting

During Charrette Week, the committee met for a neighborhood tour, and again for a progress presentation on Tuesday afternoon. Many members also participated in both open design studio sessions.

## Post-Charrette Meeting

The planning team continued to talk with the Advisory Committee to review the results of the community visioning exercises and to discuss policy needs for the area. A draft small area plan was reviewed by the Advisory Committee in May, and additional revisions were made.


Discussion during neighborhood bus tour


Visioning Session small group

## Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholder meetings with business and neighborhood groups were held before, during, and after charrette week to understand the issues and opportunities in the study area and to begin developing a vision statement to articulate the community's expectations for the future.

## Visioning Session

Public participation in the charrette began Monday evening when approximately 75 community members gathered at Howard Office Building's Sonny West Conference Room to discuss their vision and expectations for the neighborhood's future. The workshop included a presentation of what the team knew about the area and a breakout session during which participants completed three (3) group exercises on a map and reported back their work. Planning staff facilitated 10 small group discussions during the breakout session. Exercise results informed planning team's work plan throughout the remainder of the charrette week.

Overall, three major points of view emerged that the planning team would work to bring together during the remainder of Charrette Week. These points of view are from the following primary perspectives:

- Property owners who live in the neighborhood with no plans to leave (i.e. sell while the market is high) typically fell on the side of maintaining the status quo.
- Property owners seeking to sell while the market demand is high with hopes of receiving development entitlements beyond single family residential, see things differently.
- Property owners who purchased property for the purpose of redeveloping it, also see things from a different perspective


## Community Resources

Participants identified important existing community resources to preserve or enhance the neighborhood in addition to identifying desired resources currently missing. The results of this exercise told planners if there are areas that require additional attention or policy guidance.

Generally, this exercise identified the following needs for community resources:

- More neighborhood businesses and services. Nearby commercial and service uses currently misaligned with the changing demographics of the neighborhood, especially those found on Dickerson Pike and East

Trinity Lane; desire for quality grocery stores; market playing catchup, but many businesses depend on additional population and buying power growth to locate in Highland Heights.

- More parks and greenways. Currently served by one small neighborhood park, Tom Joy Park, located adjacent to MNPS head start. Opportunities for adding new publicly accessible open space abound with potential future redevelopment of parts of area.
- Preserve historic homes. Remaining homes worthy of conservation and National Register eligible have no protection from being demolished to make way for new development. Participants zeroed in on homes located adjacent to the greenhouse property and a select few others, as well as discussed appropriate additions to existing homes. Less emphasis was placed on wholesale preservation of the existing housing stock, though many emphasized that the designs for new development should blend appropriately into the existing neighborhood framework.
- More sidewalks and bikeways. A significant portion of Highland Heights escapes requirements for new sidewalks. The study area is outside the Urban Zoning Overlay (UZO), and its location in relation to centers and other walkable uses places the central core in a situation that fails to match the goals for T4 Urban Transect communities. Sidewalks are a key component of a complete urban neighborhood. Sidewalks in Highland Heights are limited to portions of Lischey, Jones, and Meridian. Dickerson Pike lacks sidewalks, though one is programmed for the east side. Neighborhood streets located west of Lischey Avenue, as well as those located north of Gatewood Avenue, generally lack sidewalks, with limited exceptions along Lischey Avenue itself, Jones Avenue, Douglas Avenue, and East Trinity Lane.
- Additional stormwater infrastructure. As described above regarding sidewalks, curb and gutter infrastructure that typically accompanies urban neighborhood infrastructure where sidewalks exist is lacking in much of Highland Heights. The street pavement width does not accommodate two lanes of traffic and on-street parking, though many residents park on-street with two vehicular wheels on the shoulder. Stormwater pools in some areas where no downstream paths exist to move it off site.
- More infrastructure maintenance and repairs.
- Additional street connections. Specific to developing areas in the northeast corner of the neighborhood, where north-south access that connects Chickasaw Avenue to East Trinity Lane is needed to more equitably distribute future trips generated by new development among the various neighborhood streets (rather than depending on one way in and one way out).


## Community Resources

Used in Exercise 1 during the Visioning Workshop, Community Resources are defined as an asset that is or can be used to improve the quality of life in a community:

- Place (school, church, library, community center)
- Community service (healthcare, education, organization)
- Business (jobs, neighborhood services)
- Person (neighbor, community leader)
- Event (farmers market, festivals, neighborhood gatherings)
- Infrastructure (sidewalks, streets, transit, utilities)
- Natural environment (trees, water, hills, wildlife)


Composite summary of Change, Grow \& Maintain exercise presented at Work-inProgress


Summary of residential building types exercise presented at Work-in-Progress

## Change, Grow \& Maintain

Participants identified areas on the neighborhood map that they felt should change, grow, or be maintained. The results of this exercise told planners if the current policies should remain or be considered for an amendment. Participants generally identified the following areas for change:

- East Trinity Lane, west of Lischey Avenue
- Intersections along Douglas Avenue at Meridian Street, Lischey Avenue, Jones Avenue and Montgomery Avenue
- Along the full length of Dickerson Pike
- Existing commercial corner at Cherokee Avenue and Jones Avenue
- Remainder of Cherokee Avenue.

In identifying the areas of change above, participants indicated their desire to maintain the residential core and revitalize/redevelop the corridors along the edge of the neighborhood.

## Residential Building Types

Participants applied building type game chips to the areas on the neighborhood map they had identified for change and growth during the previous exercise. Building type game chips represented land use and intensity. This exercise told planners which policies to consider if an amendment was necessary to achieve the Community's vision.

- Participants reached general consensus that the most intensive levels of change, building types that allow for mixed use and residential stacked flats should be along properties fronting Dickerson Pike and East Trinity Lane, as well as within previously identified small neighborhood centers at intersections with Douglas Avenue.
- Opinions varied for the core of the neighborhood.
- Many believed the core should remain lower intensity residential, not open to wholesale change in character and development pattern.
- Some, especially those with goals of selling or redeveloping their properties, identified opportunities to introduce higher intensity housing types along the extent of Meridian Street, Lischey Avenue, and Jones Avenue.

These conflicts were discussed in detail with the Advisory Committee. Solutions presented at the Work-in-Progress presentation sought to offer opportunities for balance between viewpoints and for both sides to advance their cause.

## Reporting Back

Representatives from each small group table reported back the results of their exercises to the overall group of attendees at the end of the meeting. As the results unfolded, common goals became clear.

## Open Design Studios

Open design studios, held at East Precinct on Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning of the four-day charrette, provided more than 30 stakeholders an opportunity to check in on the work in progress and participate as planners busily consolidated input and drafted proposals to present for feedback from participants.

## Work-in-Progress Presentation

The Work-in-Progress public presentation concluded the charrette on March 8th. Staff presented a summary of the week's work, including the results of the visioning exercises, the vision statement, and the planning team's concepts for achieving the community's vision and expectations.

Following the presentation, attendees interacted with planning staff stationed at multiple information boards that displayed the charrette week's work-in-progress materials. Information presented at each station is described in more detail in the following pages. Staff at each station took note of feedback received at each board. Input led to further refinement of the materials, where necessary, following Charrette Week.

## Vision Statement

This vision statement, presented in the sidebar in the right-hand column of this page, was developed during the charrette with direction from stakeholder groups and the Advisory Committee and input from the community. It is intended to represent the community's common goals and expectations for the future. Work-in-Progress meeting feedback offered general support of the vision statement, allowing staff to carry it forward, without edits, into the post-Charrette plan production.


Building type plan input from Open Design Studio

## Draft Vision Statement presented at Work-in-Progress

Highland Heights is a Nashville neighborhood with a unique character and story.

As we welcome new neighbors to our community, we will strive to keep the diversity and identity of our close knit, urban, mixed-use neighborhood.

We will reclaim and protect the character of our neighborhood fabric through sensitive design, guide change and growth along our corridors, and enhance our neighborhood centers.


Open Design Studios offered opportunities for participants to monitor progress during Charrette Week


Planning team describing draft proposals in one-on-one discussions with participants during Work-in-Progress meeting

## Community Resources

A generalized summary of resources identified by participants was presented. The themes summarized included:

- More neighborhood businesses and services
- More parks and greenways
- Preservation of historic homes
- More sidewalks and bikeways
- More stormwater infrastructure
- More infrastructure maintenance
- Additional street connections


## Work-in-Progress Draft Products

This first draft of Work-in-Progress proposals reflected the community's feedback to maintain the character of the existing neighborhood core and to direct the greatest development intensity along Dickerson Pike, East Trinity Lane, and at neighborhood centers located at important intersections along Douglas Avenue. Draft products presented at the Work-in-Progress meeting included: (These are presented in the pages that follow (descriptions of the products are provided in "The Plan" for the final version of each product.)

- Draft Community Character Policy, as presented in Figures 24 and 25
- Development Intensity Heat Map, as presented in Figure 26
- Draft Mobility Plan, as presented in Figure 27
- Draft Building Type Regulating Plan, as presented in Figure 28
- Draft Development Scenarios for two sites: (1) northwest corner of the neighborhood at the intersection of Dickerson Pike and East Trinity Lane, shown in Figure 29 and (2) Cherokee Avenue, shown in Figure 30.
- Note that a third development scenario for the greenhouses property was added following Charrette Week.

Fig. 25: Draft Policy Map
As presented during Work-in-Progress. Note that changes occurred following Work-in-Progress. Adopted version appears in "The Plan."


Fig. 26: Policy Image Examples
Photos illustrate draft policies mapped in Figure 24 (previous page), in reference to the Draft Community Character Policy Map, as presented during Work-in-Progress.

| Policy Image Examples | - |
| :---: | :---: |
| Civic (CI) | Urban Residential Corridor (T4 RC) |
| Open Space (OS) | Urban Neighborhood Center (T4 NC) |
| Urban Neighborhood Maintenance (T4 NM) | Urban Neighborhood Evolving (T4 NE) |

Fig. 27: Draft Heat Map
As presented during Work-in-Progress. Note that changes occurred following Work-in-Progress.


## Fig. 28: Draft Mobility Plan

As presented during Work-in-Progress. Note that changes occurred following Work-in-Progress. Adopted version appears in "The Plan."


Fig. 29: Draft Regulating Plan Part 1
As presented during Work-in-Progress. Note that changes occurred following Work-in-Progress. Adopted version appears in "The Plan."



* Potential Open Space

BUILDING TYPE DISTRICTS
R1 Residentia
R2 Residential R3 Residential

R4 Residential

Fig. 30: Draft Regulating Plan Part 2
As presented during Work-in-Progress. Note that changes occurred following Work-in-Progress. Adopted version appears in "The Plan."

Highland Heights Neighborhood Appropriate Building Types Matrix


Fig. 31: Draft Scenerio 1
Northwest corner of Highland Heights scenario, as presented during Work-in-Progress. Note that changes occurred following Work-in-Progress. Adopted version appears in "The Plan"


Fig. 32: Draft Scenerio 2
Cherokee Avenue scenario, as presented during Work-in-Progress. Note that changes occurred following Work-in-Progress. Adopted version appears in "The Plan."


## Charrette Follow-Up

## Greenhouse Site

Planning team met with the greenhouse ownership in late March. The meeting included a tour of the property and explanation of conceptual, long-range plans for a potentially phased move from the neighborhood that would allow for redevelopment of much of the property currently occupied by greenhouse-related structures. The team will develop a development scenario and potentially other supplemental policy components to guide future development of the site. The scenario will be presented to the Advisory Committee for review and comment prior to release to the general public.

## Plan Preparation

Planning Team will compile input from Charrette Week and develop a plan document that includes more detailed supplemental policies.

## Advisory Committee

Planning Team will meet with the Advisory Committee again in April (meeting was held in early May) to present the recommended plan for review and feedback. The study schedule allows the team to make any changes to the recommendations prior to submitting the plan for MPC review, as necessitated by committee input.

## Planning Commission

Notice sent to property owners in advance of Charrette Week included notification for a public hearing scheduled for May 24, 2018. The Planning Team will send email notice (reminder) to all Charrette Week participants and others who have requested information about the study.

