

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
THE CITY OF FOREST HILLS**

March 13, 2015

The Forest Hills Board of Zoning Appeals (herein also the “Board”) held its regular monthly meeting Friday, March 13, 2015 at the City’s Offices, 6300 Hillsboro Pike, Nashville, Tennessee, beginning at 8:00 a.m. Chairperson Janie Rowland presided. Also present were Mr. Jim Littlejohn, Mr. Mark Banks, Mr. Matt Foster, City Attorney and, Amanda Deaton-Moyer, City Manager. Others present are shown on the attached sign-in sheet. A copy of the agenda is also attached to these minutes.

1. **Approval of the minutes of the meetings dated February 13, 2015.** Mr. Banks motioned to approve the minutes from February 13, 2015 meeting. Chairperson Rowland seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

2. **Mr. Isaac Wantland of Wantland Ink and Mr. Josh White of Joshua Builders represented owners of the home located at 1216 Taggartwood.** They requested a variance to build a retaining wall up to 24 feet in height. All proposed walls over 10 feet in height require a variance. Chairperson Rowland asked Mrs. Deaton-Moyer for an explanation of the project. She explained that shortly after the 2010 Flood, a conventional wall was erected. The wall they were requesting would be above and further back from the existing wall. A soil-nail-wall structure would be utilized. Mrs. Deaton-Moyer added that the geotechnical and wall design had been reviewed by the city’s geotechnical consultant, Rick Heckel. Mr. Heckel had discussed his concerns with the contractors and new drawings had been resubmitted the drawings. Mr. Heckel was comfortable with the new submission.

Mr. Wantland discussed the placement of the wall related to the rest of the home. The homeowners were trying to make the best of the situation and create a yard space along the new wall. The proposed fence would be chain-link covered by boxwoods. The purpose of the wall was to prevent the significant erosion that was presently occurring.

Mr. Littlejohn asked if residents of Otterwood would see the wall. Mr. Wantland said the current wall was visible, but it faced Richland golf course, not homes. Mr. Littlejohn and Mr. Banks asked Mr. White about the specifics of the wall. The proposed structure was discussed. Chairperson Rowland asked about the finish of the wall. The wall would be concrete with a gun-metal finish, but could be colored a more natural color. They discussed the landscaping of the well. Mr. White explained that soil-pockets would be cut out of the wall for ivy to be planted. The ivy would ideally cover the wall. Mr. Banks asked if there was any screening for the existing wall. Mr. White said there was not. Chairperson Rowland asked if trees could be planted at the base. Mr. White said he understood their concern and trees could be planted.

Mr. Littlejohn motioned to approve the variance with the following conditions:

- (a) Regular inspections of the progress of the wall shall be conducted by the City’s Geotechnical consultant. Specifically, the consultant shall review the placement of soil nails and treatment of the toe of the hill. These reviews must be coordinated with the City.*
- (b) A vegetation plan that includes deciduous plantings for the lower area along the segmented wall must be submitted to the City for approval and implemented.*

Chairperson Rowland seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

3. **Information Session:** Mr. Doug Sharp represented developer Pete Ferarri who had an option of 1833 Cromwell Drive and three lots off of 6206 Melbourne Drive. He brought conceptual plans for four homes to be developed in the Hillside Protection Overlay District (HPOD). He sought guidance on land disturbance, ingress/egress,

and interaction with the TVA easements located on the properties. Mr. Sharp showed the Board a drawing of a concept plan that included four lots in the hillside protection overlay. Challenges included ingress/egress because two of the four lots were landlocked, significant steep slopes, and the TVA easements. He told the Board that he was there to gather feedback to determine whether he and his client should proceed with the project. There was discussion about the preferred entry: the proposal was to come in off of Cromwell, but entrance from Melbourne could be considered. Mr. Sharp said the envisioned homes would fit with the land and seek to enjoy the heavily wooded character of the lots. There was discussion about what the Zoning Code required for access. Private drives could service no more than four dwellings, Mrs. Deaton-Moyer said. The Board made clear protection of vegetation and minimum disturbance was a priority. Chairperson Rowland mentioned that “mushroom houses” (houses that are tall and protrude from vegetation) would not work in this situation. They discussed the pond as a potential storm water facility. Additionally the Board said that ingress/egress would be key to making the project viable. Chairperson Rowland told Mr. Sharp if he chose to move forward with this project, he needed to come back with as few variances as possible: bulk standard variances of height, coverage ratios, and setbacks would not be taken lightly. Mr. Sharp reminded them that the plan was conceptual and thanked them for their feedback

Kathy Crow, representing 1 Goldstone Court expressed concern. She said they had already expended significant resources to control erosion off of the TVA easement areas and expected that a development would exacerbate the issue. She stated that they took the natural resource protections of the Zoning Code very seriously, especially the hillside protection overlay. She was worried that vertical homes would destroy the pastoral view. She also questioned if the houses would be the extent of the project or if there would be other accessory structures to come in the future.

Mr. Ferarri stated that he was very appreciative of her feedback. He added that he envisioned these houses to be very “high-end” and welcomed her suggestions in the design process.

Chairperson Rowland commented that the Board shared some of her concerns. A topographic map with tree surveys would be required. She stated that height standards would be taken very seriously. She also said that no generic clearing would take place as every individual home would have to come before the Board of Zoning Appeals before grading of building permits could be issued.

4. The Meeting was adjourned.

Recorder

Chairperson