



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Fwd: #6-F-18-UR

1 message

john david buckwalter <j.david.buckwalter@gmail.com>
Reply-To: j.david.buckwalter@gmail.com
To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Wed, Jun 13, 2018 at 3:04 PM

Hello- As owner & resident of [2717 Mineral Springs Ave](#), I am strongly opposed to the current plan to redevelop the property across the street.

Sincerely, J. David Buckwalter

----- Forwarded message -----

From: john david buckwalter <j.david.buckwalter@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 13, 2018, 3:00 PM
Subject: #6-F-18-UR
To: <commission@knox.org>

Hello- As owner & resident of [2717 Mineral Springs Ave](#), I am strongly opposed to the current plan to redevelop the property across the street.

Sincerely, J. David Buckwalter

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Case file #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Donna Doyle <donnajodoyle@gmail.com>
Reply-To: donnajodoyle@gmail.com
To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Wed, Jun 13, 2018 at 2:49 PM

Begin forwarded message:

From: Donna Doyle <donnajodoyle@gmail.com>
Subject: Case file #6-F-18-UR
Date: June 13, 2018 at 2:46:45 PM EDT
To: commission@knoxpc.org

Dear Metropolitan Planning Commission Members:

I am writing to express concern regarding a development proposal for 2704 Mineral Springs (Case #6-F-18-UR).

Although I reside in West Knoxville, as a Knoxville native city development throughout the years has been of prime importance to me. I consider all of Knoxville to be my neighborhood and consider all Knoxville residents my neighbors. My main concerns about the proposed development are as follows.

- 1) The current East Sector City plan explicitly recommends that all low density residential areas adjoining Whittle Springs Road should be retained in the future. Mineral Springs is shown on this map as an area that should remain low density residential.
- 2) Housing for the elderly, low income or not, should be located in areas more amenable to the residents—within reasonable and safe walking or wheelchair distance to a chain grocery store and other amenities.
- 3) Low income housing should be located in areas where the average median income is significantly higher—such as District 2 where I reside—and not primarily in areas where income is lower.

Thank you for considering my ideas.

Regards,
Donna Doyle

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] 6-F-18-UR Helen Ross McNabb

1 message

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 13, 2018 at 2:54 PM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

I am opposed to this plan. If I had my way this would be zoned back to R-1, as would be more fitting with this neighborhood. Multi-unit apartments are not at all appropriate for this quiet, narrow street. There are many of us that do not want this to happen but few that can attend the meeting. Please deny this use.

Daniel Johnson

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR Helen Ross McNabb

3 messages

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>












Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 9:56 AM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Still photos for meeting.

These photos show the narrowness of Mineral Springs Ave, the lack of sidewalks, the dangerous crossing at the intersection with Whittle Springs, and the lack of sidewalks on Whittle Springs and further down Mineral Springs to Broadway

-  [1156.1.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01157..JPG](#)
-  [DSC01157.1.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01160.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01161.1.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01161.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01162.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01168.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01169.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01175.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01178.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01185.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01190.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01195.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01196.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01197.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01198.JPG](#)

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org

Tim Kuhn <tim.kuhn@knoxmpc.org>

Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 10:01 AM

To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com, Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>, Dori Caron <dori.caron@knoxmpc.org>

Hi Daniel,

You may want to check permissions on these images to make them publicly available:









Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

jenny@wjeversole.com <jenny@wjeversole.com>

Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 9:12 AM

Reply-To: jenny@wjeversole.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider a different location for this project. I realize the need for the project, but a narrow residential street seems like a difficult choice.

Thanks for considering this request,
Jenny Eversole

Sent from my iPhone

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 8:57 AM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Earlier this summer we all went before MPC about this property. It was decided that the whole thing needed to go before BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals) for parking considerations. The issue at the time was that they did not have enough parking spaces in their plan to satisfy MPC. When Helen Ross McNabb failed to prove a hardship needed to grant them a pass on this parking problem the Board started a motion to DENY and got a SECOND to the motion, and then at the last second their attorney pops up and somehow gets the whole thing postponed. So, we're supposed to have another BZA meeting where Helen Ross McNabb is supposed to once again prove this hardship. That doesn't happen. They don't fix this parking issue. In fact, they reduce the number of spaces in their revised plan from 40 down to 34. Somehow this whole parking spaces thing is swept under the carpet and is magically no longer an issue and we are to have another meeting before MPC to settle the whole original problem, which is the Use on Review, changing the zoning of the property from O-1 to R-2 to allow this High Density apartment complex in the middle of our quiet, Low Density Residential dead end street. There have been no public meetings since the BZA meeting and now all of a sudden Tom Brechko of MPC is completely full steam for this proposal. I can't wrap my head around that one. Helen Ross McNabb relies quite heavily on tax dollars for their existence. They have a high-priced property attorney fighting hard to get this thing approved in an extremely inappropriate location. It sure would be nice if we were afforded this luxury.

The residential and historic character of our street is clearly low density and primarily occupied by single family units on relatively large lots. The placement of High Density residential housing such as this on our street, in the middle of and surrounded by low density residential and office use is clearly inconsistent with the Sector Plan land use classifications. The Sector Plan is explicit in stating that the Whittle Springs Corridor retain the Low Density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods. It states that High Density projects like this belongs on "Major Collector and Arterial Streets, Adjacent to Regional Shopping and Major Office Districts Along Corridors with TRANSIT and SIDEWALKS". This street does not include ANY of that.

The use is NOT in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The use is NOT AT ALL compatible with the character of the neighborhood where it is proposed. The use WILL significantly injure the value of all adjacent properties. HRM's plan is to place low-income folks in here. The socioeconomic difference is certainly worth noting, but adding 50 new residents to a street that has less than 25 current residents will forever have a negative impact on our neighborhood. Our narrow street and utilities can not handle an additional 50 residents. This design and use in no way fits in.

The use WILL draw additional traffic through here. MPC's own traffic data indicates 512 average daily trips for this proposal. 512!!! I assure you that Associated Therapeutics has NEVER seen that much traffic in the 20 or so years that they have been in this structure. We are all fine with its current office/medical zoning as the existing offices are all relatively quiet and everyone leaves by 5pm and are never around on weekends. Helen Ross McNabb claims that most of the folks that would live here would not have a car. How do these folks plan on getting anywhere?? We are not near any sort of transit, especially for elderly folks that would need to walk about a third of a mile to reach the closest bus stop (that does not have a shelter) This walk would be down a road that is quite narrow, has NO sidewalks, and has a very dangerous intersection to cross. (Whittle Springs traffic does not stop in either direction at the intersection with Mineral Springs) The trip back up includes an 80ft change in elevation. It's quite a hill.

Helen Ross McNabb says the tenants intended for this property will be the same as the tenants at Northgate Tower. Northgate Tower is the source of frequent 911 calls. The Whittle Springs Fire Dept has indicated that Northgate Tower is their #1 call. They make at least one trip/shift to Northgate Tower. We already hear these multiple sirens for the tower. Imagine it being multiplied because of this new project AND the emergency vehicles would actually be invading our street with this noise and flashing lights! I cannot tell you the last time an emergency vehicle of any kind came wailing up our street. It's been years!

Please please deny this use on review. Please keep this property Office/Medical

**Attached is an important video with narration. Please share with all commissioners.

It's also available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UY5qwcNdXcQ&feature=youtu.be>

Thank you, Daniel Johnson



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR Helen Ross McNabb

1 message

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>

Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 8:19 AM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Andy Smith is a fine man and his physical therapy practice has been a fine neighbor to us but I have to respond to his statement above concerning access to the building. None of our office neighbors have very many clients at a time, even his. It is not at all the same thing as having 50 full-time residents in the middle of our neighborhood. It just isn't. This is not a collector or an arterial street. We are not on a bus line and we have no sidewalks. This street is a dead end with no other connections to it but the very busy intersection with Whittle Springs. We are probably one of the smallest, narrowest, unique streets in Knoxville. If he's referring to having a short bus come up here constantly to serve these 50 people, well, wouldn't that be fun for us to deal with? Northgate Terrace has constant traffic through it's parking lot. We cannot handle that here. Consider this: we average about 1-2 people per 3/4 acre (or more!) and this proposal would put 50 people in the middle of us on a 1.85 acre lot. Completely inappropriate.

I would also like to comment on statements made at Tuesday's MPC meeting. The planner was asked about the previous BZA meeting and the whole parking issue. He just glossed over it, saying that it's now approved. How did this get approved so mysteriously?? It certainly seemed to be a problem in the beginning. This thing has been postponed so many times now. The first time was because of the lack of parking. We go to BZA and just as they're about to deny the variance (it had a first and second motion!), HRM's attorney gets it postponed. Somehow we don't get to come back to BZA because it's magically all taken care of. Presto! Problem gone. The planner was also asked why HRM hadn't considered using the old WNOX lot, or anywhere else. He stated that it would be too difficult to build on the WNOX lot. Nonsense. That lot is larger, totally clear and on collector street. He didn't have an answer about using any other appropriate lot around town. It's like Helen Ross McNabb played pin the tail on donkey when they chose this lot. It is the worst possible place to put this project.

I also wanted to be sure that all commissioners have had a chance to view the narrated video I made about our street. It's important to watch as one can actually SEE our neighborhood and the challenges both new and existing residents would face instead of just looking at it on a map. Anyone may view the video here:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rxJGYoScSIW8I_22nH0WaUu6E1fRMPID/view?usp=sharing

I appreciate your time!

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

jenny@wjeversole.com <jenny@wjeversole.com>

Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 9:12 AM

Reply-To: jenny@wjeversole.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider a different location for this project. I realize the need for the project, but a narrow residential street seems like a difficult choice.

Thanks for considering this request,
Jenny Eversole

Sent from my iPhone

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR Helen Ross McNabb

3 messages

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>










Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 9:56 AM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Still photos for meeting.

These photos show the narrowness of Mineral Springs Ave, the lack of sidewalks, the dangerous crossing at the intersection with Whittle Springs, and the lack of sidewalks on Whittle Springs and further down Mineral Springs to Broadway

-  [1156.1.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01157..JPG](#)
-  [DSC01157.1.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01160.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01161.1.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01161.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01162.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01168.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01169.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01175.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01178.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01185.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01190.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01195.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01196.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01197.JPG](#)
-  [DSC01198.JPG](#)

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org

Tim Kuhn <tim.kuhn@knoxmpc.org>

Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 10:01 AM

To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com, Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>, Dori Caron <dori.caron@knoxmpc.org>

Hi Daniel,

You may want to check permissions on these images to make them publicly available:









Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR Helen Ross McNabb

1 message

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>

Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 8:19 AM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Andy Smith is a fine man and his physical therapy practice has been a fine neighbor to us but I have to respond to his statement above concerning access to the building. None of our office neighbors have very many clients at a time, even his. It is not at all the same thing as having 50 full-time residents in the middle of our neighborhood. It just isn't. This is not a collector or an arterial street. We are not on a bus line and we have no sidewalks. This street is a dead end with no other connections to it but the very busy intersection with Whittle Springs. We are probably one of the smallest, narrowest, unique streets in Knoxville. If he's referring to having a short bus come up here constantly to serve these 50 people, well, wouldn't that be fun for us to deal with? Northgate Terrace has constant traffic through it's parking lot. We cannot handle that here. Consider this: we average about 1-2 people per 3/4 acre (or more!) and this proposal would put 50 people in the middle of us on a 1.85 acre lot. Completely inappropriate.

I would also like to comment on statements made at Tuesday's MPC meeting. The planner was asked about the previous BZA meeting and the whole parking issue. He just glossed over it, saying that it's now approved. How did this get approved so mysteriously?? It certainly seemed to be a problem in the beginning. This thing has been postponed so many times now. The first time was because of the lack of parking. We go to BZA and just as they're about to deny the variance (it had a first and second motion!), HRM's attorney gets it postponed. Somehow we don't get to come back to BZA because it's magically all taken care of. Presto! Problem gone. The planner was also asked why HRM hadn't considered using the old WNOX lot, or anywhere else. He stated that it would be too difficult to build on the WNOX lot. Nonsense. That lot is larger, totally clear and on collector street. He didn't have an answer about using any other appropriate lot around town. It's like Helen Ross McNabb played pin the tail on donkey when they chose this lot. It is the worst possible place to put this project.

I also wanted to be sure that all commissioners have had a chance to view the narrated video I made about our street. It's important to watch as one can actually SEE our neighborhood and the challenges both new and existing residents would face instead of just looking at it on a map. Anyone may view the video here:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1rxJGYoScSIW8I_22nH0WaUu6E1fRMPID/view?usp=sharing

I appreciate your time!

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 8:57 AM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Earlier this summer we all went before MPC about this property. It was decided that the whole thing needed to go before BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals) for parking considerations. The issue at the time was that they did not have enough parking spaces in their plan to satisfy MPC. When Helen Ross McNabb failed to prove a hardship needed to grant them a pass on this parking problem the Board started a motion to DENY and got a SECOND to the motion, and then at the last second their attorney pops up and somehow gets the whole thing postponed. So, we're supposed to have another BZA meeting where Helen Ross McNabb is supposed to once again prove this hardship. That doesn't happen. They don't fix this parking issue. In fact, they reduce the number of spaces in their revised plan from 40 down to 34. Somehow this whole parking spaces thing is swept under the carpet and is magically no longer an issue and we are to have another meeting before MPC to settle the whole original problem, which is the Use on Review, changing the zoning of the property from O-1 to R-2 to allow this High Density apartment complex in the middle of our quiet, Low Density Residential dead end street. There have been no public meetings since the BZA meeting and now all of a sudden Tom Brechko of MPC is completely full steam for this proposal. I can't wrap my head around that one. Helen Ross McNabb relies quite heavily on tax dollars for their existence. They have a high-priced property attorney fighting hard to get this thing approved in an extremely inappropriate location. It sure would be nice if we were afforded this luxury.

The residential and historic character of our street is clearly low density and primarily occupied by single family units on relatively large lots. The placement of High Density residential housing such as this on our street, in the middle of and surrounded by low density residential and office use is clearly inconsistent with the Sector Plan land use classifications. The Sector Plan is explicit in stating that the Whittle Springs Corridor retain the Low Density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods. It states that High Density projects like this belongs on "Major Collector and Arterial Streets, Adjacent to Regional Shopping and Major Office Districts Along Corridors with TRANSIT and SIDEWALKS". This street does not include ANY of that.

The use is NOT in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The use is NOT AT ALL compatible with the character of the neighborhood where it is proposed. The use WILL significantly injure the value of all adjacent properties. HRM's plan is to place low-income folks in here. The socioeconomic difference is certainly worth noting, but adding 50 new residents to a street that has less than 25 current residents will forever have a negative impact on our neighborhood. Our narrow street and utilities can not handle an additional 50 residents. This design and use in no way fits in.

The use WILL draw additional traffic through here. MPC's own traffic data indicates 512 average daily trips for this proposal. 512!!! I assure you that Associated Therapeutics has NEVER seen that much traffic in the 20 or so years that they have been in this structure. We are all fine with its current office/medical zoning as the existing offices are all relatively quiet and everyone leaves by 5pm and are never around on weekends. Helen Ross McNabb claims that most of the folks that would live here would not have a car. How do these folks plan on getting anywhere?? We are not near any sort of transit, especially for elderly folks that would need to walk about a third of a mile to reach the closest bus stop (that does not have a shelter) This walk would be down a road that is quite narrow, has NO sidewalks, and has a very dangerous intersection to cross. (Whittle Springs traffic does not stop in either direction at the intersection with Mineral Springs) The trip back up includes an 80ft change in elevation. It's quite a hill.

Helen Ross McNabb says the tenants intended for this property will be the same as the tenants at Northgate Tower. Northgate Tower is the source of frequent 911 calls. The Whittle Springs Fire Dept has indicated that Northgate Tower is their #1 call. They make at least one trip/shift to Northgate Tower. We already hear these multiple sirens for the tower. Imagine it being multiplied because of this new project AND the emergency vehicles would actually be invading our street with this noise and flashing lights! I cannot tell you the last time an emergency vehicle of any kind came wailing up our street. It's been years!

Please please deny this use on review. Please keep this property Office/Medical

**Attached is an important video with narration. Please share with all commissioners.

It's also available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UY5qwcNdXcQ&feature=youtu.be>

Thank you, Daniel Johnson

ARTHUR G. SEYMOUR, JR.
ROBERT L. KAHN
REGGIE E. KEATON
DONALD D. HOWELL
DEBRA L. FULTON
MICHAEL W. EWELL
JOHN M. LAWHORN
JAMES E. WAGNER
BEVERLY D. NELMS
MARY ELIZABETH MADDOX
BENJAMIN C. MULLINS
RICHARD T. SCRUGHAM, JR.
MATTHEW A. GROSSMAN
KEVIN A. DEAN
RICHARD E. GRAVES



established 1902

client-centric & committed to success

office 865.546.9321
office fax 865.637.5249

550 W. Main Street
Suite 500
P.O. Box 39
Knoxville, Tennessee
37901

of counsel
FRANCIS A. CAIN
IMOGENE A. KING
JASON T. MURPHY

fmsllp.com

Email: ajseymour@fmsllp.com

Direct Fax: 865-541-4612

September 12, 2018

Via E-mail

MPC Commissioners

Knoxville-Knox County MPC
Suite 403, City County Building
400 Main Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Re: *Item No. 49 – Helen Ross McNabb Center*

Dear Commissioners:

I would like to enclose as part of the file on the above requested Use on Review the following:

1. Letter from Mayor Madeline Rogero dated July 23, 2018 supporting funding for the project;
2. Letter from Becky Wade, Director of Community Development with the City of Knoxville dated July 23, 2018 supporting funding for the project; and
3. Letter from Mayor Burchett dated July 25, 2018 supporting funding for the project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Arthur G. Seymour, Jr.

FRANTZ, MCCONNELL & SEYMOUR, LLP

AGSJ:lbb
Enc.



CITY OF KNOXVILLE
MADELINE ROGERO, MAYOR

July 23, 2018

Helen Ross McNabb Center
201 West Springdale Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37917

Re: Mineral Springs Manor

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing in support of the Mineral Springs Manor project and your current application for funding to FHLB Cincinnati Affordable Housing Program. Please accept this letter as a commitment to waive the building permit fee, a value of \$500, as a contribution to the project. The City understands that this letter will be submitted to FHLB Cincinnati and will be used as part of a scoring consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Madeline Rogero".

Madeline Rogero
Mayor

c: David Brace, Deputy to the Mayor/COO
Peter Ahrens, Director, Plans and Inspections



July 23, 2018

Mr. Houston Smelcer
Helen Ross McNabb Center
201 W. Springdale Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37917

Re: 2704 Mineral Springs Ave.

Dear Houston,

We are reviewing your application for City funding in the amount of \$1,500,000 for the referenced project. We are fully in support of this project and expect to take the full amount to City Council for approval, pending compliance with all eligibility requirements. The source of funding will include both the local Affordable Rental Development funds and federal HOME funds.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Becky Wade".

Becky Wade
Director, Community Development



OFFICE OF COUNTY MAYOR TIM BURCHETT

400 Main Street, Suite 615, Knoxville, TN 37902

July 25, 2018

Helen Ross McNabb Center
201 W. Springdale Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37917

To whom it may concern:

Knox County Government is dedicated to supporting the Helen Ross McNabb Center's newest endeavor to develop 50 units of independent affordable housing for low-income senior citizens in Knox County. Because of the Center's successful history of developing and operating affordable permanent supportive housing, we believe the Center is well suited to serve our community's elderly.

Knox County will provide financial support for the Mineral Springs Manor Senior Housing Project with a \$750,000 grant payable over three years beginning in FY19, subject to the County's regular contracting and approval process.

Knox County is aware that this letter of commitment is being requested in connection with an application to the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati's Affordable Housing Program.

If you have any questions or I can be of further assistance please contact me at 865-215-2005.

Sincerely,

Tim Burchett
Knox County Mayor



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

jenny@wjeversole.com <jenny@wjeversole.com>

Wed, Sep 12, 2018 at 9:12 AM

Reply-To: jenny@wjeversole.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commissioners,

Please consider a different location for this project. I realize the need for the project, but a narrow residential street seems like a difficult choice.

Thanks for considering this request,
Jenny Eversole

Sent from my iPhone

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org

ARTHUR G. SEYMOUR, JR.
ROBERT L. KAHN
REGGIE E. KEATON
DONALD D. HOWELL
DEBRA L. FULTON
MICHAEL W. EWELL
JOHN M. LAWHORN
JAMES E. WAGNER
BEVERLY D. NELMS
MARY ELIZABETH MADDOX
BENJAMIN C. MULLINS
RICHARD T. SCRUGHAM, JR.
MATTHEW A. GROSSMAN
KEVIN A. DEAN
RICHARD E. GRAVES



established 1902

client-centric & committed to success

office 865.546.9321
office fax 865.637.5249

550 W. Main Street
Suite 500
P.O. Box 39
Knoxville, Tennessee
37901

of counsel
FRANCIS A. CAIN
IMOGENE A. KING
JASON T. MURPHY

fmsllp.com

Email: ajseymour@fmsllp.com

Direct Fax: 865-541-4612

September 12, 2018

Via E-mail

MPC Commissioners

Knoxville-Knox County MPC
Suite 403, City County Building
400 Main Street
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Re: *Item No. 49 – Helen Ross McNabb Center*

Dear Commissioners:

I would like to enclose as part of the file on the above requested Use on Review the following:

1. Letter from Mayor Madeline Rogero dated July 23, 2018 supporting funding for the project;
2. Letter from Becky Wade, Director of Community Development with the City of Knoxville dated July 23, 2018 supporting funding for the project; and
3. Letter from Mayor Burchett dated July 25, 2018 supporting funding for the project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Arthur G. Seymour, Jr.

FRANTZ, McCONNELL & SEYMOUR, LLP

AGSJ:lbb
Enc.

SAWDOX\CLIENTS\2630\0095119\CORRESPON\1757832.DOCX



CITY OF KNOXVILLE
MADELINE ROGERO, MAYOR

July 23, 2018

Helen Ross McNabb Center
201 West Springdale Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37917

Re: Mineral Springs Manor

To Whom It May Concern:

I'm writing in support of the Mineral Springs Manor project and your current application for funding to FHLB Cincinnati Affordable Housing Program. Please accept this letter as a commitment to waive the building permit fee, a value of \$500, as a contribution to the project. The City understands that this letter will be submitted to FHLB Cincinnati and will be used as part of a scoring consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Madeline Rogero".

Madeline Rogero
Mayor

c: David Brace, Deputy to the Mayor/COO
Peter Ahrens, Director, Plans and Inspections



July 23, 2018

Mr. Houston Smelcer
Helen Ross McNabb Center
201 W. Springdale Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37917

Re: 2704 Mineral Springs Ave.

Dear Houston,

We are reviewing your application for City funding in the amount of \$1,500,000 for the referenced project. We are fully in support of this project and expect to take the full amount to City Council for approval, pending compliance with all eligibility requirements. The source of funding will include both the local Affordable Rental Development funds and federal HOME funds.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Becky Wade".

Becky Wade
Director, Community Development



OFFICE OF COUNTY MAYOR TIM BURCHETT

400 Main Street, Suite 615, Knoxville, TN 37902

July 25, 2018

Helen Ross McNabb Center
201 W. Springdale Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37917

To whom it may concern:

Knox County Government is dedicated to supporting the Helen Ross McNabb Center's newest endeavor to develop 50 units of independent affordable housing for low-income senior citizens in Knox County. Because of the Center's successful history of developing and operating affordable permanent supportive housing, we believe the Center is well suited to serve our community's elderly.

Knox County will provide financial support for the Mineral Springs Manor Senior Housing Project with a \$750,000 grant payable over three years beginning in FY19, subject to the County's regular contracting and approval process.

Knox County is aware that this letter of commitment is being requested in connection with an application to the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati's Affordable Housing Program.

If you have any questions or I can be of further assistance please contact me at 865-215-2005.

Sincerely,

Tim Burchett
Knox County Mayor



[MPC Comment] Comments Regarding Use on Review #6-F-18-UR (Mineral Springs Avenue)

1 message

Matthew <mhigdon99@gmail.com>
Reply-To: mhigdon99@gmail.com
To: commission@knoxmpc.org
Cc: lrider@knoxvilletn.gov

Mon, Jun 11, 2018 at 7:28 PM

Dear Commission Members,

Please accept the MPC Staff Recommendation regarding #6-F-18-UR and postpone consideration of this proposal.

My name is Matthew Higdon and I reside at [2811 Mineral Springs Avenue \(37917\)](#). I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the “Use on Review” application brought by the Helen Ross McNabb Center, which is seeking approval to develop 50 apartments for seniors at [2704 Mineral Springs Avenue](#), currently zoned Office-1. The proposal calls for renovating an existing office building for 32 apartments and building a new 3-story apartment complex on the east side of the property with 18 units.

As explained below, the proposal is inconsistent with the East City Sector Plan, does not comply with standards for R-2 zoning, provides infrastructure and transportation challenges, and thereby, would adversely affect the residents and character of our small neighborhood.

Inconsistencies with the East City Sector Plan (2014):

My primary concern is that the apartment development of this size (with 50 dwelling units) is not suitable at this location because it conflicts with the current neighborhood character and land use. The 2014 Sector Plan identifies the planned use of our portion of Mineral Springs Avenue (the section east of the intersection with Whittle Springs Road) as low density residential. The three properties on the south side of the street currently zoned as Office-1 are generally consistent with the low density residential setting in their current use as medical offices/facilities.

This proposal would create a density on the property of greater than 27 units per acre, which the Sector Plan defines as a “high density” multi-dwelling residential development (see page 47). The residential and historic character of our street is clearly low density and primarily occupied by single family units on relatively large lots. The placement of high density residential housing on our street, in the middle of and surrounded by low density residential and office use is clearly inconsistent with the Sector Plan land use classifications.

The Sector Plan is explicit. The plan highlights the “Whittle Springs Corridor” as an “Opportunity Area” on page 28 and includes important objectives and recommendations for the corridor that includes Mineral Springs Avenue, including:

“Retain the low density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods.”

Notably, the plan also states that past development along the corridor has occurred in a pattern that provides neighborhood stability which “needs to continue.” The plan goes so far as to recommend that R-2 areas near our street be rezoned to R-1 to ensure the low density character of the neighborhood. The McNabb Center proposal is clearly inconsistent with this recommendation.

The location criteria identified in the Sector Plan for high density residential states that such development belongs on “major collector and arterial streets, adjacent to regional shopping and major office districts...”

and “along corridors with transit and sidewalks .” The location criteria for medium density residential states that projects should be “along corridors that are served by or proposed to be served by transit” and recommends sidewalks. Because our portion of Mineral Springs Avenue is classified as a “local” street, the McNabb Center apartment development clearly fails to meet these criteria.

Our street does not have suitable public transit or sidewalks for such a development, especially for seniors that may have limited transportation options. The location is on a hill, along a narrow local street, and several blocks from the nearest bus stop. The local commercial areas along Broadway are not close enough for many seniors to walk and there are no sidewalks available (without substantial detours). It is also unclear whether emergency service vehicles can adequately come and go from the proposed facility or the fire lane.

The Sector Plan recommendations and location criteria are evident when reviewing the Sector Plan Planned Use Map (page 24), which clearly illustrates the intent to preserve the low residential character of our street and the Whittle Springs Corridor, and to concentrate medium density residential along collector streets near our neighborhood, primarily along Valley View Drive to the east. There is no location on this map that where a high density residential development is planned on a small parcel surrounded by low density residential areas because such land use decisions are clearly undesirable to citizens, property owners or the planners who work to identify ways to improve our communities.

Inconsistencies with the Zoning Ordinances for R-2:

The fact that this location is not suitable for a 50-unit apartment development is evident when you consider that the proposal does not meet the General Description for R-2 districts or the basic standards for the district.

First, the General Description of the R-2 district in the Code of Ordinances states that “This is a residential district to provide medium population density. The principle uses of land may range from houses to low density multi-dwelling structures and developments.” This proposal would establish a high density use in the middle of a low density (other residences along our street are RP-1, also a low density use zone), which is clearly inconsistent with the description of an R-2 district.

Preliminary drawings provided by the Helen Ross McNabb Center to Mineral Springs residents reflect a proposal that does not have enough parking spaces, does not meet the open space standard, and fails to meet the “intensity of use” standard. While MPC may choose to waive these standards and approve the proposal anyway, I ask the MPC to consider whether waiving three key standards is appropriate given that MPC is already being asked to consider a use of the property that differs from its current land use zone designation. I understand why waiving some standards may be necessary when a similar project is planned in an R-2 zone, but it seems an applicant that wishes MPC to consider a “Use on Review” at a location that has a different zoning designation should meet each of the basic standards.

Regarding the “intensity of use” standard, the McNabb Center’s architects informed residents that this project complies with this standard and will likely make the same claim before MPC. However, please note that only by “rounding up” the size of the lot do they meet this standard. The lot is identified on kGis.org as being 1.85 acres in size, yet the applicant has used the more convenient 1.9-acre figure. Without rounding up, they do not meet the standard. The fact that they need to do this to meet the “intensity of use” standard exemplifies how tightly packed they would place apartment units into the 1.85-acre lot.

Regarding the parking standard, while it may be true that a senior living facility may not need 1.2 spaces per unit, it should be noted that our street is very narrow and if this lot ever fills, it’s likely that visitors would park along the street. This would be very problematic and inconvenient to residents because the street is so narrow. The Helen Ross McNabb Center’s assertion that their residents would not need more parking only reinforces the importance of adequate transit and sidewalk options for residents of the facility, of which there are none on our street.

The extent to which the proposal fails to meet open space requirements is troubling as well. Anyone who drives by the Northgate and Love Towers (Old North Knox) can attest to the number of residents who enjoy

open space and spend time out-of-doors. These residents enjoy ample open areas, picnic tables, benches, walking paths, and even community gardens. At the proposed site, residents would be confined to small backyard with a pavilion.

Design of New Building and Other Concerns

Residents of Mineral Springs Avenue are also concerned about other aspects of the proposal. The design of the current Associated Therapeutics building has always been inconsistent with the architecture of residences on the street, contrasting negatively with the traditional rancher, single-level homes along the street, as well as with the two other office buildings, that are attractive, red brick, colonial style structures. Under their proposal, a 3-story building similar in design to the Associated Therapeutics building is proposed. We have been told that the new building would also have cream-colored walls and an ugly, bright green/teal/turquoise colored metal pitched roof. The contrast in style would be most evident if the building is placed just feet from the traditional brick, single level rancher that will be next door to the east.

More concerning to me is the contrasts that would be created by having a three story structure in the middle of the neighborhood. Most residences along the street are brick ranchers and the three stories of the proposed building greatly conflict with the character of the residences. The relatively consistent roof lines along the street, when viewed driving up the street, would be disrupted by the three story structure (made worse by its pitched metal turquoise roof). The City's General Plan, Sector Plan and every design guidance document produced by the MPC and City for developers all emphasize appropriate design principles to avoid such contrasts and unappealing development.

It is also apparent that the Landscape Plan created by the Allan & Associates firm do not accurately show the location of several large trees that would act as visual buffers to the new 3-story building. The fire lane is shown setting between the trees but in reality, the trees have been misplaced in the drawing and would likely require removal.

Other concerns include uncertainty regarding how the construction would occur without creating challenges for residents; the street on the east side narrows sharply just above and east of the entrance to the Associated Therapeutics property. With construction on the east side of the property, it is unclear if there is enough room for work there without blocking the residences to the east. This is a dead end road and travel may be impacted.

With the narrow street, we also question the ability of emergency services to serve the apartment complex in the case of a health emergency or fire (note, all residents of our general area hear the frequent sirens en route to Northgate Tower on a daily basis). According to preliminary drawings, it is questionable whether fire engines can turn adequately out of the parking lot to travel up the road (eastward) toward the dead end. It is likewise questionable whether a large fire engine can adequately turn into the proposed fire lane, given that the width of the road at that location is only 17.5 feet. This should be reviewed.

In addition, the sidewalks proposed in the design are nice, but they go nowhere! The lot is on a hill and there are multiple utility poles in the middle of the drawn sidewalk, limiting the use for people using walkers or those in wheelchairs.

In conclusion, please postpone consideration until these issues are resolved.

I urge the MPC to carefully consider the intent of the City, planners, and residents involved in developing the Sector Plan. The Sector Plan strongly supports my position that low density residential areas along Whittle Springs Road should be retained and that high density residential should be located elsewhere. The McNabb Center's proposal clearly does not meet the basic description or standards of the R-2 district. And our street is unsuitable to meet the transit needs of seniors.

I admire the work and contributions to our city and region that the Helen Ross McNabb Center and their staff make. I think a senior living facility with fewer units would be acceptable to most residents in our community, at a medium density residential level. This might be done by abandoning the new construction altogether and

simply renovating the current building. Residents are used to the current building and would generally welcome these 32 residents into our neighborhood. Reducing the number of units would resolve the inconsistencies with the plans and with the Code of Ordinances.

Thank you for considering my comments. I request that you postpone this proposal until the July meeting, as recommended by MPC Staff, so that the problems can be reviewed more closely.

Regards,

Matthew Higdon
2811 Mineral Springs Avenue
Knoxville, TN 37917

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] proposed senior living facility by Helen Ross McNabb on Mineral Springs A venue (#6-F-18-UR)

1 message

'Allen Smith' via Commission <commission@knoxmpc.org>
Reply-To: agsmith008@yahoo.com
To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Jun 11, 2018 at 7:06 PM

It is my understanding that the above referenced project will come before MPC this week. The drawings that I have seen look to me to be incorrect. I respectfully request that you delay any vote on this project until some of the questions that the neighbors have can be resolved.

Allen G. Smith
2802 Mineral Springs Avenue
Knoxville TN 37917
, TN 37917

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Helen Ross McNabb Center's Use on Review, 9/13/18 MPC meeting.

1 message

Andy Smith <asmith@associatedtherapeutics.com>
Reply-To: asmith@associatedtherapeutics.com
To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Fri, Sep 7, 2018 at 11:41 AM

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of Helen Ross McNabb Center's plan to build 50 senior apartments at the current Associated Therapeutics, Inc. building location at [2704 Mineral Springs Ave., Knoxville, TN 37917](#). Historically, this very site was the location of the Whittle Springs Hotel. This majestic hotel was host to many social functions that provided fond memories for many current day citizens of Knoxville and the surrounding area. The hotel was in close proximity to underground mineral springs, which were advertised for their healthy and healing benefits. The hotel was torn down in 1963 and the property remained vacant until purchased in 1985 by the owners of Associated Therapeutics, Inc. in 1985. Associated Therapeutics, Incorporated constructed a privately owned rehabilitation and wellness center. The center was owned and operated by two physical therapists, Andrew Smith and Thomas Kelly. Their vision was to develop a comprehensive physical rehabilitation and wellness center with the mission "to advance the health of each individual served". The facility provided comprehensive physical rehabilitation services, aquatic therapy/ aquatic exercise programs, and fitness/wellness. Although the center provided services to all ages, the majority of the clients were in the middle to senior age range. After 33 years of practice at this location, the owners decided to downsize their business and sell the building. Their hope was for the facility to continue to be used in a way that would be of service to the Knoxville community. We were pleased when the Helen Ross McNabb Center purchased the building on 7/3/18 with the plan to convert it into an apartment building for seniors that have limited access to affordable housing in our community.

When we purchased the property in 1985 the neighbors expressed their concerns about the type of business that would be located in their neighborhood, plus the added traffic flow that would be created. For 33 years we have enjoyed a wonderful and supportive relationship with our neighbors on Mineral Springs Avenue. As they have been good neighbors, so have we. Based on Helen Ross McNabb's proven history of providing quality and compassionate care to children, adults, and families experiencing mental illness, addiction, and social challenges, the proposed building project would be an asset to the neighborhood and the City of Knoxville. Coincidentally, their mission statement of "improving the lives of the people we serve" closely mirrors the mission statement of Associated Therapeutics, Incorporated.

As for the issue of access to and from the proposed apartment building, many of the senior and handicapped clients of Associated Therapeutics, Inc. successfully utilized a variety of public transportation options. They used KAT, CAC, ETHRA, People 2 Places, and other providers of low cost, handicapped accessible public transportation to get to the facility. Getting to and from the facility was never an issue.

Based on the above, I would hope that the Knoxville-Knox County MPC would approve the re-zoning of the property and Helen Ross McNabb Center's plan to construct 50 senior apartments on the site.

Respectively submitted,

Andrew E. Smith, PT, MS
Associated Therapeutics, Inc.

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Brian McMillan <briantmcmillan@gmail.com>

Sun, Sep 9, 2018 at 2:09 PM

Reply-To: briantmcmillan@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Good Day,

I am writing to express what a mistake I believe it would be for Helen Ross McNabb to develop a 50-apartment complex at Mineral Springs Avenue. This development would be wrong for this small residential street. A development like this would be better built on a main artery. The lack of sidewalks, nearby bus stops, and commercial base would be wrong for this complex. The zoning should not be rated R-2. This development would be both detrimental to the residents of the neighborhood and street and also the potential residents of the complex.

Thank you,

Brian McMillan

PO Box 27793

Knoxville, TN 37927

865-254-8979

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Jon Saint Germain <johnriggs@comcast.net>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 7:12 AM

Reply-To: johnriggs@comcast.net

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

To Whom it may Concern,

As you probably know, Helen Ross McNabb has purchased the Associated Therapeutics building on Whittle Springs Rd/Mineral Springs Rd Area . They intend to gut the property, build 32 apartments inside there, as well as build a 3 story structure in the upper parking lot, housing an additional 18 apartments in it (50 total). There are approximately 25 people currently living on this street, and they plan to bring in high-density apartments and triple that number. The Helen Ross McNabb Center intends to populate this complex with low- income elderly, much like the residents of Northgate Terrace.

The City Sector Plan is explicit in stating that the Whittle Springs Corridor retain the Low Density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods. It states that high density projects like this belongs on "major collector and arterial streets, adjacent to regional shopping and major office districts along corridors with transit and sidewalks."

Mineral Spring Road has no sidewalks and there are no sidewalks all the way down to Broadway, where the nearest bus stop is, not to mention the hazardous intersection at Whittle and Mineral Springs that an elderly person would have to cross.

Northgate Terrace is the #1 call for the Whittle Springs Fire Department. Since we are on the side of the ridge we hear those constant sirens. If this complex is allowed, those sirens and lights will actually be invading our quiet, narrow street. These are just a few reasons this sort of thing is highly inappropriate and detrimental for our street.

Nobody in this neighborhood welcomes this development. If this resolution gets passed, it opens the door for other properties in the area to follow suit and build unwanted apartment buildings where none are needed, or desired.

The proposal is here: https://agenda.knoxmpc.org/packages/6-F-18-UR_pkg.pdf

Please take this into consideration when you consider this proposal.

Sincerely,

John Riggs
Laurie Ireland
Homeowners
3914 Whittle Springs Rd
Knoxville TN 37917

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Comments: Use on Review #6-F-18-UR (Mineral Springs Avenue)

1 message

Matthew <mhigdon99@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 2:21 PM

Reply-To: mhigdon99@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commission:

Please add these comments to those I submitted by email on June 11, 2018, regarding the Helen Ross McNabb Center's (HRM Center) proposal for 2704 Mineral Springs Avenue (#6-F-18-UR).

I am extremely disappointed that despite the months that have passed, the HRM Center has taken no initiative to meet again with our neighborhood, despite our requests. For a project funded by public sources, and proposed by an organization that receives most of its funding from taxpayers, I expected there to be more transparency and disclosure in this process. Only after failing to convince the Board of Zoning Appeals of the merits of the proposal in July did they contact me. I was told in August that they were considering our concerns but unfortunately, their recently revised design is worse than their initial design.

I am likewise disappointed to read the MPC Staff Recommendation regarding this Use of Review. Inexplicably, the MPC Staff has ignored in their report the *explicit* MPC recommendations in the Easy City Sector Plan regarding the preservation of low-density neighborhoods along the Whittle Springs Corridor (an "Opportunity Area" highlighted in the Plan) and regarding the siting of high-density developments only along major or collector roads that provide transit and sidewalk amenities. I don't understand how the MPC Staff fails to point this out while also stating that the proposal is consistent with the Plan.

The Staff Recommendation also incorrectly states that this development, which includes a new 3-story building, would be consistent with the character of the neighborhood. This is an *incredible* statement that has no basis and betrays their inability to look beyond the map that shows the parcel's approved use and visit the location to understand our neighborhood and the uses of adjoining properties.

I ask that you please consider the uses of adjacent parcels in making your decision. The subject parcel is adjacent on three sides to single family homes with large lots. These adjacent properties and those along Mineral Springs Avenue define the character of our

street and that is completely ignored by MPC Staff. This character would be irreparably altered by the construction of a 3-story apartment building on a high point in the middle of our block.

As I said in June, it is not appropriate or ‘good planning’ to locate a high-density complex on such a narrow “local” street with no transit/sidewalk amenities. The 3-story building would be especially offensive and out of place (why has no consideration been given to building a 2-story building instead?). The Sector Plan clearly shows that high-density developments should be concentrated elsewhere in the sector.

As I’ve stated previously, there are other serious issues and practical problems associated with locating this development on our street. The lack of on-street parking is problematic, especially given the HRM Center’s assertion that they need only 34 parking spaces for 50 units (note, their Parking Study was developed only after they failed to get a simple variance for parking from BZA and is seemingly *contradicted* by the traffic study that estimates the development will generate 512 vehicle trips daily!). In addition to the lack of sidewalks or public transit, the intersection at Whittle Springs Drive (that pedestrians would encounter) is among the most dangerous and confusing in our sector. Also, I do not believe the local fire station has been consulted on ingress and egress from the location.

Please abide by common sense planning and siting principles and deny the approval of this apartment complex. Placing such a development in the middle of a single-family residential street is not appropriate. Please deny this application and follow MPC’s own recommendations for the Whittle Springs area and preserve the low-density character of Mineral Springs Avenue.

Thanks again for your consideration,

Matthew Higdon

2811 Mineral Springs Avenue

P.S. The applicant failed to post a yard sign notifying residents of their business at the September 13 meeting until September 7 (one week later than stated in the terms of the “Required Sign Posting Agreement” signed on April 30 by the applicant). When I asked your staff about this, I was told that sign posting is merely a “courtesy” and aren’t actually “required.” Please consider revising your administrative procedures to *require* this public notice for a two week period.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Matthew <mhigdon99@gmail.com>
Date: June 11, 2018 at 7:28:27 PM EDT

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Cc: l rider@knoxvilletn.gov

Subject: Comments Regarding Use on Review #6-F-18-UR (Mineral Springs Avenue)

Dear Commission Members,

Please accept the MPC Staff Recommendation regarding #6-F-18-UR and postpone consideration of this proposal.

My name is Matthew Higdon and I reside at [2811 Mineral Springs Avenue \(37917\)](#). I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the “Use on Review” application brought by the Helen Ross McNabb Center, which is seeking approval to develop 50 apartments for seniors at [2704 Mineral Springs Avenue](#), currently zoned Office-1. The proposal calls for renovating an existing office building for 32 apartments and building a new 3-story apartment complex on the east side of the property with 18 units.

As explained below, the proposal is inconsistent with the East City Sector Plan, does not comply with standards for R-2 zoning, provides infrastructure and transportation challenges, and thereby, would adversely affect the residents and character of our small neighborhood.

Inconsistencies with the East City Sector Plan (2014):

My primary concern is that the apartment development of this size (with 50 dwelling units) is not suitable at this location because it conflicts with the current neighborhood character and land use. The 2014 Sector Plan identifies the planned use of our portion of Mineral Springs Avenue (the section east of the intersection with Whittle Springs Road) as low density residential. The three properties on the south side of the street currently zoned as Office-1 are generally consistent with the low density residential setting in their current use as medical offices/facilities.

This proposal would create a density on the property of *greater than 27 units per acre*, which the Sector Plan defines as a “high density” multi-dwelling residential development (see page 47). The residential and historic character of our street is clearly low density and primarily occupied by single family units on relatively large lots. The placement of *high density* residential housing on our street, in the middle of and surrounded by low density residential and office use is clearly inconsistent with the Sector Plan land use classifications.

The Sector Plan is explicit. The plan highlights the “Whittle Springs Corridor” as an “*Opportunity Area*” on page 28 and includes important objectives and recommendations for the corridor that includes Mineral Springs Avenue, including:

“Retain the low density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods.”

Notably, the plan also states that past development along the corridor has occurred in a pattern that provides neighborhood stability which “*needs to continue.*” The plan goes so far as to recommend that R-2 areas near our street be rezoned to R-1 to ensure the low density character of the neighborhood. The McNabb Center proposal is clearly inconsistent with this recommendation.

The location criteria identified in the Sector Plan for high density residential states that such development belongs on “*major collector and arterial streets, adjacent to regional shopping and major office districts...*” and “*along corridors with transit and sidewalks.*” The location criteria for medium density residential states that projects should be “*along corridors that are served by or proposed to be served by transit*” and recommends sidewalks. Because our portion of Mineral Springs Avenue is classified as a “local” street, the McNabb Center apartment development clearly fails to meet these criteria.

Our street does not have suitable public transit or sidewalks for such a development, especially for seniors that may have limited transportation options. The location is on a hill, along a narrow local street, and several blocks from the nearest bus stop. The local commercial areas along Broadway are not close enough for many seniors to walk and there are no sidewalks available (without substantial detours). It is also unclear whether emergency service vehicles can adequately come and go from the proposed facility or the fire lane.

The Sector Plan recommendations and location criteria are evident when reviewing the Sector Plan Planned Use Map (page 24), which *clearly* illustrates the intent to preserve the low residential character of our street and the Whittle Springs Corridor, and to concentrate medium density residential along collector streets near our neighborhood, primarily along Valley View Drive to the east. There is no location on this map that where a high density residential development is planned on a small parcel surrounded by low density residential areas because such land use decisions are clearly undesirable to citizens, property owners or the planners who work to identify ways to improve our communities.

Inconsistencies with the Zoning Ordinances for R-2:

The fact that this location is not suitable for a 50-unit apartment development is evident when you consider that the proposal does not meet the General Description for R-2 districts or the basic standards for the district.

First, the General Description of the R-2 district in the Code of Ordinances states that “*This is a residential district to provide medium population density. The principle uses of land may range from houses to low density multi-dwelling structures and developments.*” This proposal would establish a *high density* use in the middle of a low density (other residences along our street are RP-1, also a low density use zone), which is clearly inconsistent with the description of an R-2 district.

Preliminary drawings provided by the Helen Ross McNabb Center to Mineral Springs residents reflect a proposal that does not have enough parking spaces, does not meet the open space standard, and fails to meet the “intensity of use” standard. While MPC may choose to waive these standards and approve the proposal anyway, I ask the MPC to consider whether waiving *three* key standards is appropriate given that MPC is already being asked to consider a use of the property that differs from its current land use zone designation. I understand why waiving some standards may be necessary when a similar project is planned in an R-2 zone, but it seems an applicant that wishes MPC to consider a “Use on Review” at a location that has a different zoning designation should meet each of the basic standards.

Regarding the “intensity of use” standard, the McNabb Center’s architects informed residents that this project complies with this standard and will likely make the same claim before MPC. However, please note that only by “rounding up” the size of the lot do they meet this standard. The lot is identified on kGis.org as being 1.85 acres in size, yet the applicant has used the more convenient 1.9-acre figure. Without rounding up, they do not meet the standard. The fact that they need to do this to meet the “intensity of use” standard exemplifies how tightly packed they would place apartment units into the 1.85-acre lot.

Regarding the parking standard, while it may be true that a senior living facility may not need 1.2 spaces per unit, it should be noted that our street is very narrow and if this lot ever fills, it’s likely that visitors would park along the street. This would be very problematic and inconvenient to residents because the street is so narrow. The Helen Ross McNabb Center’s assertion that their residents would not need more parking only reinforces the importance of adequate transit and sidewalk options for residents of the facility, of which there are none on our street.

The extent to which the proposal fails to meet open space requirements is troubling as well. Anyone who drives by the Northgate and Love Towers (Old North Knox) can attest to the number of residents who enjoy open space and spend time out-of-doors. These residents enjoy ample open areas, picnic tables, benches, walking paths, and even community gardens. At the proposed site, residents would be confined to small back yard with a pavilion.

Design of New Building and Other Concerns

Residents of Mineral Springs Avenue are also concerned about other aspects of the proposal. The design of the current Associated Therapeutics building has always been inconsistent with the architecture of residences on the street, contrasting negatively with the traditional rancher, single-level homes along the street, as well as with the two other office buildings, that are attractive, red brick, colonial style structures. Under their proposal, a 3-story building similar in design to the Associated Therapeutics building is proposed. We have been told that the new building would also have cream-colored walls and an ugly, bright green/teal/turquoise colored metal pitched roof. The contrast in style would be most evident if the building is placed just feet from the traditional brick, single level rancher that will be next door to the east.

More concerning to me is the contrasts that would be created by having a three story structure in the middle of the neighborhood. Most residences along the street are brick ranchers and the three stories of the proposed building greatly conflict with the character of the residences. The relatively consistent roof lines along the street, when viewed driving up the street, would be disrupted by the three story structure (made worse by its pitched metal turquoise roof). The City's General Plan, Sector Plan and every design guidance document produced by the MPC and City for developers all emphasize appropriate design principles to avoid such contrasts and unappealing development.

It is also apparent that the Landscape Plan created by the Allan & Associates firm do not accurately show the location of several large trees that would act as visual buffers to the new 3-story building. The fire lane is shown setting between the trees but in reality, the trees have been misplaced in the drawing and would likely require removal.

Other concerns include uncertainty regarding how the construction would occur without creating challenges for residents; the street on the east side narrows *sharply* just above and east of the entrance to the Associated Therapeutics property. With construction on the east side of the property, it is unclear if there is enough room for work there without blocking the residences to the east. This is a dead end road and travel may be impacted.

With the narrow street, we also question the ability of emergency services to serve the apartment complex in the case of a health emergency or fire (note, all residents of our general area hear the frequent sirens en route to Northgate Tower on a daily basis). According to preliminary drawings, it is questionable whether fire engines can turn adequately out of the parking lot to travel up the road (eastward) toward the dead end. It is likewise questionable whether a large fire engine can adequately turn into the proposed fire lane, given that the width of the road at that location is only 17.5 feet. This should be reviewed.

In addition, the sidewalks proposed in the design are nice, but they go nowhere! The lot is on a hill and there are multiple utility poles in the middle of the drawn sidewalk, limiting the use for people using walkers or those in wheelchairs.

In conclusion, please postpone consideration until these issues are resolved.

I urge the MPC to carefully consider the intent of the City, planners, and residents involved in developing the Sector Plan. The Sector Plan strongly supports my position that low density residential areas along Whittle Springs Road should be retained and that high density residential should be located elsewhere. The McNabb Center's proposal clearly does not meet the basic

description or standards of the R-2 district. And our street is unsuitable to meet the transit needs of seniors.

I admire the work and contributions to our city and region that the Helen Ross McNabb Center and their staff make. I think a senior living facility with fewer units would be acceptable to most residents in our community, at a medium density residential level. This might be done by abandoning the new construction altogether and simply renovating the current building. Residents are used to the current building and would generally welcome these 32 residents into our neighborhood. Reducing the number of units would resolve the inconsistencies with the plans and with the Code of Ordinances.

Thank you for considering my comments. I request that you postpone this proposal until the July meeting, as recommended by MPC Staff, so that the problems can be reviewed more closely.

Regards,

Matthew Higdon
2811 Mineral Springs Avenue
[Knoxville, TN 37917](mailto:commission@knoxmpc.org)

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] RE: Item #49 (6-f-18-UR)

1 message

m ivester <m.ivester@hotmail.com>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 1:40 PM

Reply-To: m.ivester@hotmail.com

To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing today to ask that you deny the proposal 6-F-18-UR on Mineral Springs Rd. I'm a bit baffled as to why the Helen Ross McNabb has chosen this location to build such a project as there are many other locations that would seem to be a better fit-the lot on the corner of White Springs & White Oak comes to mind.

The proposed location is on a narrow road with no sidewalks, not on a direct bus line or close to shopping which are all critical needs for elderly residents. There are other areas of Knoxville that would be a better location for this type of project than 2704 Mineral Springs. Please vote No on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Michelle Ivester
OLPNA VP
865-556-1818

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use of Review #6F-18-UR

1 message

'Britta' via Commission <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 7:11 PM

Reply-To: brittalees@yahoo.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commission:

I've recently learned of a proposal by the Helen Ross McNabb Center to build a large apartment complex on Mineral Springs Avenue, a small dead-end street not far from where I live. This is not an appropriate use given that this is a small local street primarily made up of single-family residences. As a nearby resident, I hope you will consider the character of the Whittle Springs area and preserve these small neighborhoods.

The apartment complex is clearly not consistent with the low-density residential character of that street and the new 3-story building that is proposed is far too large and out of character for location.

Please follow the recommendations approved in the East City Sector Plan and maintain the low-density residential character of the Mineral Springs Avenue neighborhood and only approve those types of apartment complexes on larger roads with adequate transit infrastructure.

Thanks,
Britta Lees
37917

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Helen Ross McNabb Center's Use on Review, 9/13/18 MPC meeting.

1 message

Andy Smith <asmith@associatedtherapeutics.com>

Fri, Sep 7, 2018 at 11:41 AM

Reply-To: asmith@associatedtherapeutics.com

To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing in support of Helen Ross McNabb Center's plan to build 50 senior apartments at the current Associated Therapeutics, Inc. building location at [2704 Mineral Springs Ave., Knoxville, TN 37917](#). Historically, this very site was the location of the Whittle Springs Hotel. This majestic hotel was host to many social functions that provided fond memories for many current day citizens of Knoxville and the surrounding area. The hotel was in close proximity to underground mineral springs, which were advertised for their healthy and healing benefits. The hotel was torn down in 1963 and the property remained vacant until purchased in 1985 by the owners of Associated Therapeutics, Inc. in 1985. Associated Therapeutics, Incorporated constructed a privately owned rehabilitation and wellness center. The center was owned and operated by two physical therapists, Andrew Smith and Thomas Kelly. Their vision was to develop a comprehensive physical rehabilitation and wellness center with the mission "to advance the health of each individual served". The facility provided comprehensive physical rehabilitation services, aquatic therapy/ aquatic exercise programs, and fitness/wellness. Although the center provided services to all ages, the majority of the clients were in the middle to senior age range. After 33 years of practice at this location, the owners decided to downsize their business and sell the building. Their hope was for the facility to continue to be used in a way that would be of service to the Knoxville community. We were pleased when the Helen Ross McNabb Center purchased the building on 7/3/18 with the plan to convert it into an apartment building for seniors that have limited access to affordable housing in our community.

When we purchased the property in 1985 the neighbors expressed their concerns about the type of business that would be located in their neighborhood, plus the added traffic flow that would be created. For 33 years we have enjoyed a wonderful and supportive relationship with our neighbors on Mineral Springs Avenue. As they have been good neighbors, so have we. Based on Helen Ross McNabb's proven history of providing quality and compassionate care to children, adults, and families experiencing mental illness, addiction, and social challenges, the proposed building project would be an asset to the neighborhood and the City of Knoxville. Coincidentally, their mission statement of "improving the lives of the people we serve" closely mirrors the mission statement of Associated Therapeutics, Incorporated.

As for the issue of access to and from the proposed apartment building, many of the senior and handicapped clients of Associated Therapeutics, Inc. successfully utilized a variety of public transportation options. They used KAT, CAC, ETHRA, People 2 Places, and other providers of low cost, handicapped accessible public transportation to get to the facility. Getting to and from the facility was never an issue.

Based on the above, I would hope that the Knoxville-Knox County MPC would approve the re-zoning of the property and Helen Ross McNabb Center's plan to construct 50 senior apartments on the site.

Respectively submitted,

Andrew E. Smith, PT, MS

Associated Therapeutics, Inc.

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Brian McMillan <briantmcmillan@gmail.com>

Sun, Sep 9, 2018 at 2:09 PM

Reply-To: briantmcmillan@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Good Day,

I am writing to express what a mistake I believe it would be for Helen Ross McNabb to develop a 50-apartment complex at Mineral Springs Avenue. This development would be wrong for this small residential street. A development like this would be better built on a main artery. The lack of sidewalks, nearby bus stops, and commercial base would be wrong for this complex. The zoning should not be rated R-2. This development would be both detrimental to the residents of the neighborhood and street and also the potential residents of the complex.

Thank you,

Brian McMillan

PO Box 27793

Knoxville, TN 37927

865-254-8979

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Jon Saint Germain <johnriggs@comcast.net>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 7:12 AM

Reply-To: johnriggs@comcast.net

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

To Whom it may Concern,

As you probably know, Helen Ross McNabb has purchased the Associated Therapeutics building on Whittle Springs Rd/Mineral Springs Rd Area . They intend to gut the property, build 32 apartments inside there, as well as build a 3 story structure in the upper parking lot, housing an additional 18 apartments in it (50 total). There are approximately 25 people currently living on this street, and they plan to bring in high-density apartments and triple that number. The Helen Ross McNabb Center intends to populate this complex with low- income elderly, much like the residents of Northgate Terrace.

The City Sector Plan is explicit in stating that the Whittle Springs Corridor retain the Low Density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods. It states that high density projects like this belongs on "major collector and arterial streets, adjacent to regional shopping and major office districts along corridors with transit and sidewalks."

Mineral Spring Road has no sidewalks and there are no sidewalks all the way down to Broadway, where the nearest bus stop is, not to mention the hazardous intersection at Whittle and Mineral Springs that an elderly person would have to cross.

Northgate Terrace is the #1 call for the Whittle Springs Fire Department. Since we are on the side of the ridge we hear those constant sirens. If this complex is allowed, those sirens and lights will actually be invading our quiet, narrow street. These are just a few reasons this sort of thing is highly inappropriate and detrimental for our street.

Nobody in this neighborhood welcomes this development. If this resolution gets passed, it opens the door for other properties in the area to follow suit and build unwanted apartment buildings where none are needed, or desired.

The proposal is here: https://agenda.knoxmpc.org/packages/6-F-18-UR_pkg.pdf

Please take this into consideration when you consider this proposal.

Sincerely,

John Riggs
Laurie Ireland
Homeowners
3914 Whittle Springs Rd
Knoxville TN 37917

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Comments: Use on Review #6-F-18-UR (Mineral Springs Avenue)

1 message

Matthew <mhigdon99@gmail.com>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 2:21 PM

Reply-To: mhigdon99@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commission:

Please add these comments to those I submitted by email on June 11, 2018, regarding the Helen Ross McNabb Center's (HRM Center) proposal for 2704 Mineral Springs Avenue (#6-F-18-UR).

I am extremely disappointed that despite the months that have passed, the HRM Center has taken no initiative to meet again with our neighborhood, despite our requests. For a project funded by public sources, and proposed by an organization that receives most of its funding from taxpayers, I expected there to be more transparency and disclosure in this process. Only after failing to convince the Board of Zoning Appeals of the merits of the proposal in July did they contact me. I was told in August that they were considering our concerns but unfortunately, their recently revised design is worse than their initial design.

I am likewise disappointed to read the MPC Staff Recommendation regarding this Use of Review. Inexplicably, the MPC Staff has ignored in their report the *explicit* MPC recommendations in the Easy City Sector Plan regarding the preservation of low-density neighborhoods along the Whittle Springs Corridor (an "Opportunity Area" highlighted in the Plan) and regarding the siting of high-density developments only along major or collector roads that provide transit and sidewalk amenities. I don't understand how the MPC Staff fails to point this out while also stating that the proposal is consistent with the Plan.

The Staff Recommendation also incorrectly states that this development, which includes a new 3-story building, would be consistent with the character of the neighborhood. This is an *incredible* statement that has no basis and betrays their inability to look beyond the map that shows the parcel's approved use and visit the location to understand our neighborhood and the uses of adjoining properties.

I ask that you please consider the uses of adjacent parcels in making your decision. The subject parcel is adjacent on three sides to single family homes with large lots. These adjacent properties and those along Mineral Springs Avenue define the character of our

street and that is completely ignored by MPC Staff. This character would be irreparably altered by the construction of a 3-story apartment building on a high point in the middle of our block.

As I said in June, it is not appropriate or ‘good planning’ to locate a high-density complex on such a narrow “local” street with no transit/sidewalk amenities. The 3-story building would be especially offensive and out of place (why has no consideration been given to building a 2-story building instead?). The Sector Plan clearly shows that high-density developments should be concentrated elsewhere in the sector.

As I’ve stated previously, there are other serious issues and practical problems associated with locating this development on our street. The lack of on-street parking is problematic, especially given the HRM Center’s assertion that they need only 34 parking spaces for 50 units (note, their Parking Study was developed only after they failed to get a simple variance for parking from BZA and is seemingly *contradicted* by the traffic study that estimates the development will generate 512 vehicle trips daily!). In addition to the lack of sidewalks or public transit, the intersection at Whittle Springs Drive (that pedestrians would encounter) is among the most dangerous and confusing in our sector. Also, I do not believe the local fire station has been consulted on ingress and egress from the location.

Please abide by common sense planning and siting principles and deny the approval of this apartment complex. Placing such a development in the middle of a single-family residential street is not appropriate. Please deny this application and follow MPC’s own recommendations for the Whittle Springs area and preserve the low-density character of Mineral Springs Avenue.

Thanks again for your consideration,

Matthew Higdon

2811 Mineral Springs Avenue

P.S. The applicant failed to post a yard sign notifying residents of their business at the September 13 meeting until September 7 (one week later than stated in the terms of the “Required Sign Posting Agreement” signed on April 30 by the applicant). When I asked your staff about this, I was told that sign posting is merely a “courtesy” and aren’t actually “required.” Please consider revising your administrative procedures to *require* this public notice for a two week period.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Matthew <mhigdon99@gmail.com>
Date: June 11, 2018 at 7:28:27 PM EDT

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Cc: l rider@knoxvilletn.gov

Subject: Comments Regarding Use on Review #6-F-18-UR (Mineral Springs Avenue)

Dear Commission Members,

Please accept the MPC Staff Recommendation regarding #6-F-18-UR and postpone consideration of this proposal.

My name is Matthew Higdon and I reside at [2811 Mineral Springs Avenue \(37917\)](#). I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the “Use on Review” application brought by the Helen Ross McNabb Center, which is seeking approval to develop 50 apartments for seniors at [2704 Mineral Springs Avenue](#), currently zoned Office-1. The proposal calls for renovating an existing office building for 32 apartments and building a new 3-story apartment complex on the east side of the property with 18 units.

As explained below, the proposal is inconsistent with the East City Sector Plan, does not comply with standards for R-2 zoning, provides infrastructure and transportation challenges, and thereby, would adversely affect the residents and character of our small neighborhood.

Inconsistencies with the East City Sector Plan (2014):

My primary concern is that the apartment development of this size (with 50 dwelling units) is not suitable at this location because it conflicts with the current neighborhood character and land use. The 2014 Sector Plan identifies the planned use of our portion of Mineral Springs Avenue (the section east of the intersection with Whittle Springs Road) as low density residential. The three properties on the south side of the street currently zoned as Office-1 are generally consistent with the low density residential setting in their current use as medical offices/facilities.

This proposal would create a density on the property of *greater than 27 units per acre*, which the Sector Plan defines as a “high density” multi-dwelling residential development (see page 47). The residential and historic character of our street is clearly low density and primarily occupied by single family units on relatively large lots. The placement of *high density* residential housing on our street, in the middle of and surrounded by low density residential and office use is clearly inconsistent with the Sector Plan land use classifications.

The Sector Plan is explicit. The plan highlights the “Whittle Springs Corridor” as an “*Opportunity Area*” on page 28 and includes important objectives and recommendations for the corridor that includes Mineral Springs Avenue, including:

“Retain the low density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods.”

Notably, the plan also states that past development along the corridor has occurred in a pattern that provides neighborhood stability which “*needs to continue.*” The plan goes so far as to recommend that R-2 areas near our street be rezoned to R-1 to ensure the low density character of the neighborhood. The McNabb Center proposal is clearly inconsistent with this recommendation.

The location criteria identified in the Sector Plan for high density residential states that such development belongs on “*major collector and arterial streets, adjacent to regional shopping and major office districts...*” and “*along corridors with transit and sidewalks.*” The location criteria for medium density residential states that projects should be “*along corridors that are served by or proposed to be served by transit*” and recommends sidewalks. Because our portion of Mineral Springs Avenue is classified as a “local” street, the McNabb Center apartment development clearly fails to meet these criteria.

Our street does not have suitable public transit or sidewalks for such a development, especially for seniors that may have limited transportation options. The location is on a hill, along a narrow local street, and several blocks from the nearest bus stop. The local commercial areas along Broadway are not close enough for many seniors to walk and there are no sidewalks available (without substantial detours). It is also unclear whether emergency service vehicles can adequately come and go from the proposed facility or the fire lane.

The Sector Plan recommendations and location criteria are evident when reviewing the Sector Plan Planned Use Map (page 24), which *clearly* illustrates the intent to preserve the low residential character of our street and the Whittle Springs Corridor, and to concentrate medium density residential along collector streets near our neighborhood, primarily along Valley View Drive to the east. There is no location on this map that where a high density residential development is planned on a small parcel surrounded by low density residential areas because such land use decisions are clearly undesirable to citizens, property owners or the planners who work to identify ways to improve our communities.

Inconsistencies with the Zoning Ordinances for R-2:

The fact that this location is not suitable for a 50-unit apartment development is evident when you consider that the proposal does not meet the General Description for R-2 districts or the basic standards for the district.

First, the General Description of the R-2 district in the Code of Ordinances states that “*This is a residential district to provide medium population density. The principle uses of land may range from houses to low density multi-dwelling structures and developments.*” This proposal would establish a *high density* use in the middle of a low density (other residences along our street are RP-1, also a low density use zone), which is clearly inconsistent with the description of an R-2 district.

Preliminary drawings provided by the Helen Ross McNabb Center to Mineral Springs residents reflect a proposal that does not have enough parking spaces, does not meet the open space standard, and fails to meet the “intensity of use” standard. While MPC may choose to waive these standards and approve the proposal anyway, I ask the MPC to consider whether waiving *three* key standards is appropriate given that MPC is already being asked to consider a use of the property that differs from its current land use zone designation. I understand why waiving some standards may be necessary when a similar project is planned in an R-2 zone, but it seems an applicant that wishes MPC to consider a “Use on Review” at a location that has a different zoning designation should meet each of the basic standards.

Regarding the “intensity of use” standard, the McNabb Center’s architects informed residents that this project complies with this standard and will likely make the same claim before MPC. However, please note that only by “rounding up” the size of the lot do they meet this standard. The lot is identified on kGis.org as being 1.85 acres in size, yet the applicant has used the more convenient 1.9-acre figure. Without rounding up, they do not meet the standard. The fact that they need to do this to meet the “intensity of use” standard exemplifies how tightly packed they would place apartment units into the 1.85-acre lot.

Regarding the parking standard, while it may be true that a senior living facility may not need 1.2 spaces per unit, it should be noted that our street is very narrow and if this lot ever fills, it’s likely that visitors would park along the street. This would be very problematic and inconvenient to residents because the street is so narrow. The Helen Ross McNabb Center’s assertion that their residents would not need more parking only reinforces the importance of adequate transit and sidewalk options for residents of the facility, of which there are none on our street.

The extent to which the proposal fails to meet open space requirements is troubling as well. Anyone who drives by the Northgate and Love Towers (Old North Knox) can attest to the number of residents who enjoy open space and spend time out-of-doors. These residents enjoy ample open areas, picnic tables, benches, walking paths, and even community gardens. At the proposed site, residents would be confined to small back yard with a pavilion.

Design of New Building and Other Concerns

Residents of Mineral Springs Avenue are also concerned about other aspects of the proposal. The design of the current Associated Therapeutics building has always been inconsistent with the architecture of residences on the street, contrasting negatively with the traditional rancher, single-level homes along the street, as well as with the two other office buildings, that are attractive, red brick, colonial style structures. Under their proposal, a 3-story building similar in design to the Associated Therapeutics building is proposed. We have been told that the new building would also have cream-colored walls and an ugly, bright green/teal/turquoise colored metal pitched roof. The contrast in style would be most evident if the building is placed just feet from the traditional brick, single level rancher that will be next door to the east.

More concerning to me is the contrasts that would be created by having a three story structure in the middle of the neighborhood. Most residences along the street are brick ranchers and the three stories of the proposed building greatly conflict with the character of the residences. The relatively consistent roof lines along the street, when viewed driving up the street, would be disrupted by the three story structure (made worse by its pitched metal turquoise roof). The City's General Plan, Sector Plan and every design guidance document produced by the MPC and City for developers all emphasize appropriate design principles to avoid such contrasts and unappealing development.

It is also apparent that the Landscape Plan created by the Allan & Associates firm do not accurately show the location of several large trees that would act as visual buffers to the new 3-story building. The fire lane is shown setting between the trees but in reality, the trees have been misplaced in the drawing and would likely require removal.

Other concerns include uncertainty regarding how the construction would occur without creating challenges for residents; the street on the east side narrows *sharply* just above and east of the entrance to the Associated Therapeutics property. With construction on the east side of the property, it is unclear if there is enough room for work there without blocking the residences to the east. This is a dead end road and travel may be impacted.

With the narrow street, we also question the ability of emergency services to serve the apartment complex in the case of a health emergency or fire (note, all residents of our general area hear the frequent sirens en route to Northgate Tower on a daily basis). According to preliminary drawings, it is questionable whether fire engines can turn adequately out of the parking lot to travel up the road (eastward) toward the dead end. It is likewise questionable whether a large fire engine can adequately turn into the proposed fire lane, given that the width of the road at that location is only 17.5 feet. This should be reviewed.

In addition, the sidewalks proposed in the design are nice, but they go nowhere! The lot is on a hill and there are multiple utility poles in the middle of the drawn sidewalk, limiting the use for people using walkers or those in wheelchairs.

In conclusion, please postpone consideration until these issues are resolved.

I urge the MPC to carefully consider the intent of the City, planners, and residents involved in developing the Sector Plan. The Sector Plan strongly supports my position that low density residential areas along Whittle Springs Road should be retained and that high density residential should be located elsewhere. The McNabb Center's proposal clearly does not meet the basic

description or standards of the R-2 district. And our street is unsuitable to meet the transit needs of seniors.

I admire the work and contributions to our city and region that the Helen Ross McNabb Center and their staff make. I think a senior living facility with fewer units would be acceptable to most residents in our community, at a medium density residential level. This might be done by abandoning the new construction altogether and simply renovating the current building. Residents are used to the current building and would generally welcome these 32 residents into our neighborhood. Reducing the number of units would resolve the inconsistencies with the plans and with the Code of Ordinances.

Thank you for considering my comments. I request that you postpone this proposal until the July meeting, as recommended by MPC Staff, so that the problems can be reviewed more closely.

Regards,

Matthew Higdon
2811 Mineral Springs Avenue
[Knoxville, TN 37917](mailto:commission@knoxmpc.org)

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] RE: Item #49 (6-f-18-UR)

1 message

m ivester <m.ivester@hotmail.com>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 1:40 PM

Reply-To: m.ivester@hotmail.com

To: "commission@knoxmpc.org" <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing today to ask that you deny the proposal 6-F-18-UR on Mineral Springs Rd. I'm a bit baffled as to why the Helen Ross McNabb has chosen this location to build such a project as there are many other locations that would seem to be a better fit-the lot on the corner of White Springs & White Oak comes to mind.

The proposed location is on a narrow road with no sidewalks, not on a direct bus line or close to shopping which are all critical needs for elderly residents. There are other areas of Knoxville that would be a better location for this type of project than 2704 Mineral Springs. Please vote No on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Michelle Ivester
OLPNA VP
865-556-1818

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

[MPC Comment] Use of Review #6F-18-UR

1 message

'Britta' via Commission <commission@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Sep 10, 2018 at 7:11 PM

Reply-To: brittalees@yahoo.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Dear Commission:

I've recently learned of a proposal by the Helen Ross McNabb Center to build a large apartment complex on Mineral Springs Avenue, a small dead-end street not far from where I live. This is not an appropriate use given that this is a small local street primarily made up of single-family residences. As a nearby resident, I hope you will consider the character of the Whittle Springs area and preserve these small neighborhoods.

The apartment complex is clearly not consistent with the low-density residential character of that street and the new 3-story building that is proposed is far too large and out of character for location.

Please follow the recommendations approved in the East City Sector Plan and maintain the low-density residential character of the Mineral Springs Avenue neighborhood and only approve those types of apartment complexes on larger roads with adequate transit infrastructure.

Thanks,
Britta Lees
37917

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



[MPC Comment] Use on Review #6-F-18-UR

1 message

Daniel Johnson <1danieljohnson1@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 11, 2018 at 8:57 AM

Reply-To: 1danieljohnson1@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Earlier this summer we all went before MPC about this property. It was decided that the whole thing needed to go before BZA (Board of Zoning Appeals) for parking considerations. The issue at the time was that they did not have enough parking spaces in their plan to satisfy MPC. When Helen Ross McNabb failed to prove a hardship needed to grant them a pass on this parking problem the Board started a motion to DENY and got a SECOND to the motion, and then at the last second their attorney pops up and somehow gets the whole thing postponed. So, we're supposed to have another BZA meeting where Helen Ross McNabb is supposed to once again prove this hardship. That doesn't happen. They don't fix this parking issue. In fact, they reduce the number of spaces in their revised plan from 40 down to 34. Somehow this whole parking spaces thing is swept under the carpet and is magically no longer an issue and we are to have another meeting before MPC to settle the whole original problem, which is the Use on Review, changing the zoning of the property from O-1 to R-2 to allow this High Density apartment complex in the middle of our quiet, Low Density Residential dead end street. There have been no public meetings since the BZA meeting and now all of a sudden Tom Brechko of MPC is completely full steam for this proposal. I can't wrap my head around that one. Helen Ross McNabb relies quite heavily on tax dollars for their existence. They have a high-priced property attorney fighting hard to get this thing approved in an extremely inappropriate location. It sure would be nice if we were afforded this luxury.

The residential and historic character of our street is clearly low density and primarily occupied by single family units on relatively large lots. The placement of High Density residential housing such as this on our street, in the middle of and surrounded by low density residential and office use is clearly inconsistent with the Sector Plan land use classifications. The Sector Plan is explicit in stating that the Whittle Springs Corridor retain the Low Density residential character in the adjoining neighborhoods. It states that High Density projects like this belongs on "Major Collector and Arterial Streets, Adjacent to Regional Shopping and Major Office Districts Along Corridors with TRANSIT and SIDEWALKS". This street does not include ANY of that.

The use is NOT in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The use is NOT AT ALL compatible with the character of the neighborhood where it is proposed. The use WILL significantly injure the value of all adjacent properties. HRM's plan is to place low-income folks in here. The socioeconomic difference is certainly worth noting, but adding 50 new residents to a street that has less than 25 current residents will forever have a negative impact on our neighborhood. Our narrow street and utilities can not handle an additional 50 residents. This design and use in no way fits in.

The use WILL draw additional traffic through here. MPC's own traffic data indicates 512 average daily trips for this proposal. 512!!! I assure you that Associated Therapeutics has NEVER seen that much traffic in the 20 or so years that they have been in this structure. We are all fine with its current office/medical zoning as the existing offices are all relatively quiet and everyone leaves by 5pm and are never around on weekends. Helen Ross McNabb claims that most of the folks that would live here would not have a car. How do these folks plan on getting anywhere?? We are not near any sort of transit, especially for elderly folks that would need to walk about a third of a mile to reach the closest bus stop (that does not have a shelter) This walk would be down a road that is quite narrow, has NO sidewalks, and has a very dangerous intersection to cross. (Whittle Springs traffic does not stop in either direction at the intersection with Mineral Springs) The trip back up includes an 80ft change in elevation. It's quite a hill.

Helen Ross McNabb says the tenants intended for this property will be the same as the tenants at Northgate Tower. Northgate Tower is the source of frequent 911 calls. The Whittle Springs Fire Dept has indicated that Northgate Tower is their #1 call. They make at least one trip/shift to Northgate Tower. We already hear these multiple sirens for the tower. Imagine it being multiplied because of this new project AND the emergency vehicles would actually be invading our street with this noise and flashing lights! I cannot tell you the last time an emergency vehicle of any kind came wailing up our street. It's been years!

Please please deny this use on review. Please keep this property Office/Medical

**Attached is an important video with narration. Please share with all commissioners.

It's also available here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UY5qwcNdXcQ&feature=youtu.be>

Thank you,
Daniel Johnson

 **Mineral Springs and Helen Ross McNabb.mp4**

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org