



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

[MPC Comment] Hardin valley development

1 message

dr.dabbs <dr.dabbs@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 7, 2017 at 7:42 PM

Reply-To: dr.dabbs@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

Hello,

I am writing concerning June 8th agenda items 16 and 41, but also further developments.

Hardin valley has been so appealing because of it's farm land and trees and some lower housing density areas. This appeal needs to be kept in mind for approving further developments. Currently the developers here are requesting as many houses per acre as possible with little concern for the community and future planning. Well thought out, appropriate, and safe development is good for our community, but mass development at max housing density allowance because of a hot market is not.

Specifically agenda item 41. The development definitely needs to be limited to appropriate housing density and should not allow any significant deviation from zoning and density restrictions that would further hurt the community's appeal.

The hillside and ridge top restrictions must be strictly observed to protect our topography.

Again, growth is healthy for a community, but there needs to be appropriate consideration for the residents' safety, and smart planning.

In this case, the traffic and road changes that will necessarily come with further developments along north Campbell station have not been adequately addressed. There needs to be a plan for widening and making the road safer as the traffic count has gotten well above 4000 cars per day. If there is no way to safely or affordably do so then more restrictions or a hold on developments should be enacted until further study is done or a plan is in place.

I live on north Campbell station rd and have seen such a drastic increase in traffic, accidents, and near misses over the past 3 years. Many spots along the road have no shoulder at all with large drop-offs and sharp curves. With more households using this as a connector rd, there also comes more pedestrians and bikers using the road, because of no sidewalk or shoulder, another significant issue.

Thank you for your consideration

Ryan Dabbs M.D.

1811 north Campbell station rd.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S7 edge, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



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

[MPC Comment] June 8 meeting

1 message

Sherry West <swest65@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 7, 2017 at 6:48 AM

Reply-To: swest65@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

MPC Team,

I would like to support your decision for Agenda Item #41, Bittle subdivision, that the hillside would not be suitable for that amount of homes Bittle has requested and to limit this development to 62 houses, I have been informed that this is your current recommendation.

Another development for Campbell Station is also on your agenda, Item #16 We are on a well for our home's water supply. We have had this well since we have lived here which is 31 years this month. I do not know the water tables and how all of these new developments (Healy, Bittle and location for Item # 16) could or could not affect the water tables. Healy development has been started for several months and I have concerns on the hilltop grading that been done and wonder if this is being monitored. Our concern is damage to the source of our water would be devastating to us if it was contaminated by any of these contractors. Please keep this in mind and advise us of anything we should do to address this issue further.

Thank you for your time and service,

Martin and Sherry West
1900 N Campbell Station Rd

--

This message was directed to commission@knoxmpc.org



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

[MPC Comment] 6-SC-17-C Comments

1 message

Austin Albright <austin.albright@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 7, 2017 at 11:58 AM

Reply-To: austin.albright@gmail.com

To: commission@knoxmpc.org

The publicly available concept plan filings for 6-SC-17-C has only been four pages of which a site plan was not part of until June 1, 2017. The only information that was publicly available were the variances requested and the property's boundaries and location.

Due to these facts this item should be postponed till the next MPC meeting to allow for the public to properly review and provide our comments and concerns regarding the impact this development will have on our community.

If MPC chooses to ignore the lack of true details provided to the public, I encourage you to request details on how the builder expects to prevent flooding and the complete destruction of the area north of the development as the just posted site plan which also does not meet the administrative rules regarding topographic elevation indicators at 2-foot intervals or include the proposed grading plan.

The south most lots will lay directly on the spring. The retention basin will be on top of the spring. The location of the spring which is THE source of the creek that runs south from the property intended for development till it joins Hickory Creek will be completely decimated. That spring and creek are used by the downstream property owners. It is not a trivial spring it produces a significant volume of water. Enough to create a creek. Also, even if the retention basin is redesigned will it discharge its contents into the spring? The run off from all the homes will include all sorts of fertilizers, pesticides, and other chemicals since what is currently a natural meadow will be converted to groomed lawns! The spring is not a industrial drain!

The concept plan should NOT be approved prior to a detail grading plan being provided and made public.

The "conversion" of a spring into a drain for a retention basin is exactly what has happened at the subdivision 6-SC-16-C that was approved by MPC. Historic Pitts Spring on that site has been graded into and the discharge of the massive retention basin directed straight into the spring!!! What's to keep this from happening again here. At least on the grading plan approved for 6-SC-16-C (which has is not what the Heally Homes ended up doing --- where's the enforcement of approved plans??) showed a protection zone for the spring... which they have not implemented, but there is nothing of the sort for the spring on 6-SC-17-C. If you actually view the topographical maps and geo-reference them with the only recently available site-map the spring is in the retention basin. Geo-referencing the site plan and actual topography is extremely difficult to do by hand since

Additionally, North Campbell Station Rd. is not a wide road. It has no shoulders and is quite curve. The increased traffic volumes projected by the already approved development only increases the hazard of this narrow road. In the last 12 months we have had the road closed at least 4 times that I am aware of due to trees falling across the road. In the last 12 months we have had one wreck and also a fire (which may have involved a wreck, but I only saw the aftermath of the fire) in the S-curve between El Rancho Trail and the 2036 N. Campbell Station Rd.

The lots abutting N. Campbell Station Rd. will be at risk for vehicles actually ending up in their yards. Especially, in bad weather.

A modern traffic study is desperately needed for N. Campbell Station Rd. The ability to widen N. Campbell Station Rd. is only going to be more difficult and expensive without someone either the authority and ability to require that space be left for such future activity. The ability to widen and should be use and should be used to meter the amount of development along N. Campbell Station Rd. If you travel this road on a regular basis or live off it you would know that the traffic study is so out dated it is worthless and that widening the road would be difficult and expensive if it was all still undeveloped and now it will be next to impossible especially with houses situated so close to the S-curve... the worst most accident prone section of N. Campbell Station already.

Please, at least delay until approval until the developer's site plan include actually showing the location of the spring on the site map, not just leaving it off and showing only utilities.

Sincerely,
Austin Albright