



---

## Comments on 4-E-13-SP - Tazewell Pike

1 message

---

**Kevin P. Murphy** <murphysprings@gmail.com>

Wed, Apr 10, 2013 at 9:55 AM

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

Cc: Herb Anders <herb@claibornehauling.com>, Bart Carey <bartcarey@comcast.net>, Art Clancy <artclancy3@gmail.com>, Laura Cole <cole5137@bellsouth.net>, "George A. Ewart" <gewart@georgeewart.com>, Len Johnson <lenedna@bellsouth.net>, Michael Kane <makane1@bellsouth.net>, Nate Kelly <Nathan.J.Kelly@gmail.com>, Charles Lomax Jr <cflomax@hotmail.com>, Rebecca Longmire <rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com>, Brian Pierce <brianpierce@mbiarch.com>, Jeffrey Roth <jwroth@qmwkx.com>, Wes Stowers <wstowers@stowerscat.com>, Janice Tocher <jtocher.mpc@gmail.com>

Hello,

I'm commenting on item 4-E-13-SP on the April 11, 2013 Knox MPC agenda for a sector plan amendment on parcel 29 231 from AG to RC.

The existing sector plan is exclusively AG this general vicinity area and does not envision a commercial designation in this area. It clearly expresses an intent that this corridor area should be an agricultural area and does not recognize a need to establish a commercial node in this area; that area being served by the Gibbs Crossroads commercial node to the northeast.

I understand that this is a small parcel, and that the proposed sector plan designation (RC) and zoning (CR) are generally appropriate for this area. However, it would be the first time the sector plan has been updated to indicate any type of commercial use in this area, and I believe that represents a significant change in the vision for the northeast Tazewell Pike planning vision. Any changes like that should be proposed and debated during the sector plan update process, and not through a spot-change to accommodate a rezoning request.

If approved, I fear that the precedent will allow other adjacent parcels to be redesignated. There are no controls on how large a commercial node can become once established, and in almost every sector plan amendment application I see, the justification "adjacent <commercial> designation to the <north,east,south,west>" appears to be sufficient to extend this. How will the MPC control expansion of a commercial node at this intersection if a sector plan amendment is passed? I don't see any mitigation or reasoning listed in the report.

I also find it hard to believe that this is an obvious or significant error or omission in the plan. The plan indicates intent, and it can be incongruous with the underlying zoning when the plan is passed. There are other commercially-zoned parcels in the area, and it seems clear that while the underlying zoning may have been previously zoned commercial, the intent was clearly that this should develop as an agricultural and rural residential area.

I'm also opposed to the rezoning of the property; just because the property has been used for commercial use even though it was designated agricultural zoning doesn't mean that it should be forgiven and updated.

This item needs to be carefully considered, and in my view should not be approved. It's letting the camel's nose into the tent by establishing a commercial precedent in the Northeast County sector plan for this area, without any involvement or input from the community.

-Kevin

Kevin P. Murphy

4508 Murphy Rd  
Knoxville, TN 37918