

Dear Planning Commissioners:

If you cannot consider whether the proposed development will be owner-occupied homes, then please consider the following:

- **Unresponsive Developer**

Why has the developer not responded to basic questions asked by Edwards Place Residents about the development? Do you truly believe if the developer is already unresponsive to our questions that a successful partnership between the developer and existing residents will exist? We need you to be our voice. We are desperately asking you to be our voice and ask questions.

- **Subdivision within a Subdivision and two separate HOAs**

A subdivision within a subdivision creates division and prevents a cohesive neighborhood. Two different HOAs will be problematic, especially when there is no clear distinction on where one neighborhood ends and one begins.

- **Other Interested Developers**

There are other developers who have expressed interest in completing Edwards Place as was originally intended. The current applicant is not the only option.

- **Planning Commission required an amenity area which has still never been installed**

The Planning Commission required an amenity area in the original Edwards Place development plan that the commission approved (this is even referenced in the Woodbury Crossing case report by the planning staff). The amenity area was never installed even though it was a requirement, so why is this still not a requirement today?

- **Elimination of original vision and improvement opportunities for Edwards Place**

How does this plan improve Edwards Place or continue the original vision approved by the Planning Commission? From what little information we have been provided, Woodbury Crossing will eliminate any possibility of improving Edwards Place or seeing the original plan complete.

- **No accountability for Woodbury Crossing on maintaining any portions of Edwards Place (including any common areas or entrance area)**

If Woodbury Crossing will have its own name and its own HOA, why is it not required to have its own entrance? Woodbury Crossing will reap the benefit of relying on Edwards Place streets for its sole means of transportation, but their HOA will not be responsible for maintaining any portions within Edwards Place (including the entrance area).

- **This is an afterthought – not planned residential**

Remember that this zone is supposed to be Planned Residential. How does this afterthought deviation from the original plan fit into Planned Residential when it fails to meet the criteria provided in the general description of Planned Residential in Knox County's Code of Ordinances?

- **Edwards Place Residents left with the ramifications of this vote**

Please do not set us up for failure. If you approve this plan, you will do just that and those of us who call Edwards Place home will have to live with your decision for our remaining time in the neighborhood.

Misty Richards
Edwards Place Resident