



Fwd: Reference: MPC Agenda Item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)

1 message

Dan Kelly <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>
To: Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 8:33 AM

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

From: <kidisboss1@comcast.net>
Date: Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 9:57 PM
Subject: Reference: MPC Agenda Item #29 – The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)
To: dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org

Dear Sir/Madame,

Reference: MPC Agenda Item #29 – The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I am not in agreement with. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA and expect Knox county representatives to complete due diligence as to the developers true plans for phase II development.

Respectfully,

Richard Borrelli

2444 Brooke Willow Blvd.

Knoxville, TN 37932

--
Dan Kelly
MPC, Development Services Manager
[\(865\) 215-2500](tel:(865)215-2500)

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thus, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Susan Daugherty

2413 Brooke Willow Blvd
Knoxville, TN 37932
865.249.8185

dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org
herb@claibornehauling.com
bartcarey@comcast.net
artclancy3@gmail.com
llcole712@gmail.com
eason.mpc@gmail.com
mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com
lenedna@bellsouth.net
makane1@bellsouth.net
cflomax@hotmail.com
rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com
brianpierce@mbiarch.com
jwroth@qmwkx.com
wstowers@stowerscat.com
jtocher.mpc@gmail.com

Fwd: Item # 29 (The Glen at Hardin Valley Unit 2, MPC file # 3-SH-14-F)

1 message

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 3:12 PM

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

From: **Duren, Kurt** <Kurt.Duren@tetrattech.com>
Date: Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 2:55 PM
Subject: Item # 29 (The Glen at Hardin Valley Unit 2, MPC file # 3-SH-14-F)
To: "contact@knoxmpc.org" <contact@knoxmpc.org>

Commissioners,

In addition to being a homeowner in the Glen at Hardin Valley, I am also a registered Professional Engineer, with approximately 25 years of practice in the field of Civil Engineering. I am well aware of our subdivision issues as they relate to property rights, storm water management (both during construction and post-development), and other aspects of the development. I have initiated multiple meetings and/or discussions with the engineer of record for both phases of this development (Fulghum, McIndoe and Associates) and Knox County Stormwater Management Department. My primary focus has been explaining why the current storm water plan will not work, since Phase II owners do not have rights to use the ponds in Phase I, as it (Phase II) is not subjected to the Declaration of Restrictive Covenants of Phase I. In every case, I have been met with complete agreement that one property owner cannot shed runoff onto a neighboring property.

The only remaining issue, or so I thought, was whether Phase II was subjected to the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I; however, the attached letter from Esq. Roden establishes the developer's position that Phase II is not subjected to the Declaration. So, how is it that Phase II design can be approved since it clearly sheds runoff into the existing Phase I ponds?

Just today (~10:30 am), I contacted Eric Mosley to discuss this issue and he assured me that a maintenance agreement/contract to enjoin the two developments in maintaining the common ponds is being signed by himself (Eric Mosely) and Ben Testerman, and that I will be in receipt of the agreement later today (Wednesday) ... one day before the MPC meeting for Final Plat approval!?!? At this time, I have yet to lay my eyes upon a maintenance agreement so I have no idea what language it might contain

In the end, residents will be left to figure out who owes for this and who owes for that, while the developers quietly disappear to their next project. I prefer we get it right the first time, and I'm not sure we are there yet.

This plan has always been misrepresented to Knox County as an extension of Phase I. The developers continue to seek out ways to associate the two developments, but yet avoid subjecting the property to the Declaration of Phase I. **Let them be what they want to be ... a separate development.**

My time to submit is running out. I look forward to meaningful discussion at tomorrow's meeting.

Respectfully,

Kurt Duren, P.E. | Project Engineer

kurt.duren@tetrattech.com

865-220-4744

[Tetra Tech, Inc.](#)

1093 Commerce Park Drive

Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Main: [865-220-4700](tel:865-220-4700)

Fax: [865-483-2014](tel:865-483-2014)

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, business confidential, and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

2 attachments



STAN RODEN LETTER.pdf

602K



Glen at Hardin Valley MPC Presentation March 2014 - revised.pptx

1009K



Fwd: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)

8 messages

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 11:04 AM

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

From: **Vic Adamson** <vicadamson@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 11:03 AM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)
To: "contact@knoxmpc.org" <contact@knoxmpc.org>
Cc: "dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org" <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>, "jwroth@qmwkx.com" <jwroth@qmwkx.com>, "herb@claibornehauling.com" <herb@claibornehauling.com>, "bartcarey@comcast.net" <bartcarey@comcast.net>, "artclancy3@gmail.com" <artclancy3@gmail.com>, "llcole712@gmail.com" <llcole712@gmail.com>, "eason.mpc@gmail.com" <eason.mpc@gmail.com>, "mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com" <mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com>, "lenedna@bellsouth.net" <lenedna@bellsouth.net>, "makane1@bellsouth.net" <makane1@bellsouth.net>, "cflomax@hotmail.com" <cflomax@hotmail.com>, "rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com" <rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com>, "brianpierce@mbiarch.com" <brianpierce@mbiarch.com>, "wstowers@stowerscat.com" <wstowers@stowerscat.com>, "jtocher.mpc@gmail.com" <jtocher.mpc@gmail.com>

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds and potentially other common amenities, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Vic and Monica Adamson
2529 Bridge Valley Ln

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 1:11 PM

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

From: **Brooke Satkowiak** <bsatkowiak@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 1:03 PM
Subject: Re: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)
To: "contact@knoxmpc.org" <contact@knoxmpc.org>

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property.

However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Brooke Satkowiak

2512 Bridge Valley Lane

Knoxville, TN 37932

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 1:36 PM

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

From: **Angela Erfman** <aerfman@bdry.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 1:31 PM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)
To: "contact@knoxmpc.org" <contact@knoxmpc.org>

From: Angela Erfman

Sent: Monday, March 10, 2014 1:03 PM

To: 'dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org'; 'herb@claibornehauling.com'; 'bartcarey@comcast.net'; 'artclancy3@gmail.com'; 'llcole712@gmail.com'; 'eason.mpc@gmail.com'; 'mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com'; 'lenedna@bellsouth.net'; 'makane1@bellsouth.net'; 'cflomax@hotmail.com'; 'rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com'; 'brianpierce@mbiarch.com'; 'jwroth@qmwkx.com'; 'wstowers@stowerscat.com'; 'jtocher.mpc@gmail.com'

Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Angela Erfman

Controller

B-Dry, LLC

4300 Papermill Drive

Knoxville, TN 37909

Homeowner

2519 Brooke Willow Blvd.

Knoxville, TN 37909

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 1:56 PM

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

From: **Satkowiak, Thomas** <tomsid@utk.edu>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 1:50 PM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)
To: "contact@knoxmpc.org" <contact@knoxmpc.org>

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property.

However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Thomas Satkowiak

2512 Bridge Valley Lane

Knoxville, TN 37932

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 2:49 PM

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

From: **John and Patricia Cupp** <jwpfcupp@yahoo.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 2:49 PM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)
To: "contact@knoxmpc.org" <contact@knoxmpc.org>
Cc: John Cupp <johncupp1@gmail.com>

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

John and Patricia Cupp
2424 Brooke Willow Blvd
Knoxville, TN 37932

Phase I, Lot 87 - The Glen at Hardin Valley

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 7:52 AM

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

From: <timedgemon@comcast.net>

Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 6:57 PM

Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)

To: contact@knoxmpc.org, dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org, herb@claibornehauling.com, bartcarey@comcast.net, artclancy3@gmail.com, llcole712@gmail.com, eason.mpc@gmail.com, mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com, linedna@bellsouth.net, makane1@bellsouth.net, cflomax@hotmail.com, rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com, brianpierce@mbiarch.com, jwroth@qmwkx.com, wstowers@stowerscat.com, jtocher.mpc@gmail.com

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,
Timothy Edgemon
2401 Brooke Willow Blvd
Knoxville, TN. 37932

Dan Kelly <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>
To: Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 8:12 AM

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Dan Kelly
MPC, Development Services Manager
(865) 215-2500

Dan Kelly <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>
To: Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 8:20 AM

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

From: **Angela Erfman** <aerfman@bdry.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 1:02 PM

Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)

To: "dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org" <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>, "herb@claibornehauling.com" <herb@claibornehauling.com>, "bartcarey@comcast.net" <bartcarey@comcast.net>, "artclancy3@gmail.com" <artclancy3@gmail.com>, "llcole712@gmail.com" <llcole712@gmail.com>, "eason.mpc@gmail.com" <eason.mpc@gmail.com>, "mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com" <mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com>, "lenedna@bellsouth.net" <lenedna@bellsouth.net>, "makane1@bellsouth.net" <makane1@bellsouth.net>, "cflomax@hotmail.com" <cflomax@hotmail.com>, "rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com" <rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com>, "brianpierce@mbiarch.com" <brianpierce@mbiarch.com>, "jwroth@qmwkx.com" <jwroth@qmwkx.com>, "wstowers@stowerscat.com" <wstowers@stowerscat.com>, "jttocher.mpc@gmail.com" <jttocher.mpc@gmail.com>

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have



Fwd: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 10:35 AM

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

From: **Amy Gilbert** <amyccompton@hotmail.com>
Date: Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 9:46 AM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F)
To: "dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org" <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>, "herb@claibornehauling.com" <herb@claibornehauling.com>, "bartcarey@comcast.net" <bartcarey@comcast.net>, "artclancy3@gmail.com" <artclancy3@gmail.com>, "llcole712@gmail.com" <llcole712@gmail.com>, "eason.mpc@gmail.com" <eason.mpc@gmail.com>, "mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com" <mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com>, "lenedna@bellsouth.net" <lenedna@bellsouth.net>, "makane1@bellsouth.net" <makane1@bellsouth.net>, "cflomax@hotmail.com" <cflomax@hotmail.com>, "rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com" <rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com>, "brianpierce@mbiarch.com" <brianpierce@mbiarch.com>, "jwroth@qmwkx.com" <jwroth@qmwkx.com>, "wstowers@stowerscat.com" <wstowers@stowerscat.com>, "jtocher.mpc@gmail.com" <jtocher.mpc@gmail.com>
Cc: "contact@knoxmpc.org" <contact@knoxmpc.org>

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA), I'm writing to object to the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II of The Glen at Hardin Valley.

The developers who have purchased Phase II have given the impression that they have no intention of abiding by the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I. And as it stands, Phase II property is not legally bound to the Phase I HOA.

That being said, the Phase II drainage plan has Phase II storm water draining into the detention ponds of Phase I. The Phase II developer has no right to utilize these because the Phase I ponds are the common property and responsibility of the Phase I HOA. I am opposing the approval of the Final Plat of the Phase II property because as submitted, the Phase II development conflicts with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

While I don't oppose the development of Phase II, I do oppose the representation that its development is inclusive to Phase I.

Respectfully submitted,

Amy Gilbert

2512 Brooke Willow Blvd. The Glen at Hardin Valley, lot 81

Sent from my iPhone



Fwd: The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II plans

1 message

Dan Kelly <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org> Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 10:24 AM

To: Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>, Mark Donaldson <mark.donaldson@knoxmpc.org>, Buz Johnson <buz.johnson@knoxmpc.org>, Tom Brechko <tom.brechko@knoxmpc.org>, Emily Dills <emily.dills@knoxmpc.org>

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

From: **Louis Kohler** <louisandsage@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 9:41 AM

Subject: The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II plans

To: dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org, herb@claibornehauling.com, bartcarey@comcast.net, artclancy3@gmail.com, lcole712@gmail.com, eason.mpc@gmail.com, mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com, lenedna@bellsouth.net, makane1@bellsouth.net, cflomax@hotmail.com, rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com, brianpierce@mbiarch.com, jwroth@qmwkx.com, wstowers@stowerscat.com, jtocher.mpc@gmail.com

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Louis V Kohler
2524 Bridge Valley Lane
Knoxville, Tn. 37932

--

Dan Kelly
MPC, Development Services Manager
(865) 215-2500



Fwd: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).

1 message

Dan Kelly <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org> Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 10:25 AM
To: Betty Jo Mahan <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>, Mark Donaldson <mark.donaldson@knoxmpc.org>, Buz Johnson <buz.johnson@knoxmpc.org>, Tom Brechko <tom.brechko@knoxmpc.org>, Emily Dills <emily.dills@knoxmpc.org>

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

From: **McNabb, Andrew (GE Intelligent Platforms)** <Andrew.Mcnabb@ge.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 8:16 AM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).
To: "dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org" <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>, "herb@claibornehauling.com" <herb@claibornehauling.com>, "bartcarey@comcast.net" <bartcarey@comcast.net>, "artclancy3@gmail.com" <artclancy3@gmail.com>, "llcole712@gmail.co" <llcole712@gmail.co>, "eason.mpc@gmail.com" <eason.mpc@gmail.com>, "mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com" <mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com>, "lenedna@bellsouth.net" <lenedna@bellsouth.net>, "makane1@bellsouth.net" <makane1@bellsouth.net>, "cflomax@hotmail.com" <cflomax@hotmail.com>, "rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com" <rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com>, "brianpierce@mbiarch.com" <brianpierce@mbiarch.com>, "jwroth@qmwkx.com" <jwroth@qmwkx.com>, "wstowers@stowerscat.com" <wstowers@stowerscat.com>, "jtocher.mpc@gmail.com" <jtocher.mpc@gmail.com>

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

James Andrew McNabb
2429 Brooke Willow Blvd
The Glen at Hardin Valley

Project Manager

GE Intelligent Platforms

Global Professional Services Americas

--

Dan Kelly

MPC, Development Services Manager

[\(865\) 215-2500](tel:(865)215-2500)



Fwd: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Thu, Mar 13, 2014 at 8:08 AM

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

From: **JASON** <jason.roback@comcast.net>
Date: Wed, Mar 12, 2014 at 11:20 PM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).
To: herb@claibornehauling.com, bartcarey@comcast.net, artclancy3@gmail.com, llcole712@gmail.com, eason.mpc@gmail.com, mgoodwin.mpc@gmail.com, lenedna@bellsouth.net, makane1@bellsouth.net, cfloxmax@hotmail.com, rebeccalongmire@hotmail.com, brianpierce@mbiarch.com, jwroth@gmwkx.com, wstowers@stowerscat.com, jtocher.mpc@gmail.com, dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org, contact@knoxmpc.org
Cc: linda.roback@comcast.net

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, we are aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point with which we strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, we oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, we will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Jason and Linda Roback
2528 Bridge Valley Lane
Knoxville, TN 37932



Fwd: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).

1 message

Sarah Powell <sarah.powell@knoxmpc.org>
To: "Mahan, Betty Jo" <bettyjo.mahan@knoxmpc.org>

Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 11:25 AM

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

From: **sschwepler** <saschwepler@comcast.net>
Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 11:16 AM
Subject: MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).
To: contact@knoxmpc.org

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully,

Steve & Kathy Schwepler
2433 Brooke Willow Blvd.
Knoxville, TN 37932



Fwd: , MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).

1 message

Dan Kelly <dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org>

Tue, Mar 11, 2014 at 8:14 AM

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

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

From: **Jim Vandergriff** <jamesvandergriff@comcast.net>

Date: Mon, Mar 10, 2014 at 2:56 PM

Subject: , MPC agenda item #29 - The Glen at Hardin Valley Phase II (3-SH-14-F).

To: dan.kelly@knoxmpc.org

Dear Sir/Madame,

As an existing homeowner in Phase I of The Glen at Hardin Valley subdivision, and a member of the Phase I homeowners association (HOA) of the same, I do not object to the development of the Phase II property. However, I am aware the developer of Phase II represented to Knox County the Phase II development as inclusive to Phase I, a point I strongly disagree. As it is, the Phase II developers purchased the Phase II property free and clear of the Declaration of Covenants of Phase I, meaning Phase II property IS NOT legally bound to the Phase I HOA. Thusly, I oppose the approval of the Final Plat for Phase II, as the Phase II drainage plan conveys storm water from Phase II, into the detention ponds of Phase I, to which the Phase II developer has no right of use. The Phase I ponds are common property to the Phase I HOA and are maintained by the same. Thereby, the approval of the proposed Phase II development is in direct conflict with the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

In order for the development to uphold the property rights of the Phase I HOA, the Phase II property would have to be annexed into the existing Phase I HOA, thereby assuring the Phase II homeowners will rightly share in the burden of maintaining the Phase I ponds, OR the Phase II design be modified to capture and detain Phase II post-development runoff within the boundaries of the Phase II property. Until such time, I will continue to fight to maintain the property rights of the Phase I HOA.

Respectfully, James Vandergriff

{2437 Brooke Willow Blvd.}

--
Dan Kelly
MPC, Development Services Manager
(865) 215-2500