

## Statement regarding Subdivision Concept Plan 3-SB-21-C

**This development will be a concentrated, massive area of high-density housing surrounded by agricultural land. The environmental impact has been poorly studied. The need for high-density housing in this area has not been established. The low-density neighborhoods and agricultural land nearby, and the surrounding infrastructure, are not capable of handling this development. The developers have not adequately studied or accounted for the external costs of their development that the communities nearby will have to shoulder.**

The disruption and resulting costs to the County -- meaning, to all current residents -- due to orders-of-magnitude increases in vehicular traffic alone will be costly and burdensome, and totally unnecessary. **Schools, businesses, utilities, and other infrastructure are not equipped to handle what might represent, at various junctions in supply lines, a two-, five-, or even ten-fold increase in demand.** This region (Mascot, Eastwood, Neal's Landing, Sunnyview, and surrounding areas) suffer from some of the most frequent and lengthiest unplanned power outages from KUB, due to already strained power infrastructure. Developers in these areas have already demonstrated, frequently, a failure to plan for ecological impact, from complex issues related to forestation and wildlife, down to the basics like disrupting water flow through various low-lying lots -- often with serious consequences for everyone, existing home-owners, the future home-owner on those lots, and the County.

The developer for 3-SB-21-C, and apparently the County too, seem to have chosen not to acknowledge these impacts, which means they presumably have not planned for them either. **The development is completely incongruous with the surrounding communities, and this plan in particular represents harm to the ecology, economy, infrastructure, and well-being of East Knox County.** If the developer can sell 482 houses (high density) at \$120k apiece, they can sell 150 houses (low density) at \$250k apiece too, while still making a tidy return on their investment. If a high density development represents a marginal increase in the developer's profits, and also substantial cost and irreversible harm to communities in Strawberry Plains, should the tax-paying public be forced to shoulder that burden just to create a marginal (perhaps even negligible) increase in the developer's R.O.I.?

### **Is Knox County in the business of sticking taxpayers with a bill for the costs of builders' ambitions?**

Do we hold a marginal increase in R.O.I. for property developers in such high esteem that we engage in corporate socialism by forcing taxpayers to subsidize these developments for years to come in unwanted and unnecessary costs to the County? It would be cheaper for Knox County to reimburse the developer the marginal difference in profits than it would be to redevelop this region's infrastructure properly to support high-density housing, which means **either the County will be passing along a massive cost to the taxpayers, or else that the infrastructure will remain as-is and will be overwhelmed and unable to support increased usage and demand.**

Is that the choice the Count wants to make, five years from now when our roads are falling apart, our traffic accident rate is through the roof, and our schools are packed like cans of sardines? Or perhaps the County could save us the trouble and ask the developer to formulate a marginally less profitable plan that adheres to the low-density, agriculturally-friendly spirit of the community. We would prefer a plan that will not decimate our existing infrastructure and forcibly redefine the community as something other than the scattered quiet, low-density neighborhoods interspersed with family-owned agricultural land, and while our preferences may not be paramount, the costs to Knox County -- the tax-paying public -- is paramount. **At no time did anyone in the County agree to subsidize unnecessarily dense housing that serves no purpose and meets no need in our communities.** Quality over quantity may sound like an outdated business principle, but even if the developer seeks quantity (meaning high density), they ought to be constrained by the external costs of this development that will inevitably be foisted onto the County and the Strawberry Plains communities.

This development must be replanned in such a way that it: (a) conforms to **the low-density and agricultural norms** of the surrounding communities; (b) puts **no unnecessary strain on nearby infrastructure**, including but not limited to schools, roadways, police and fire, electric, water, telecom, and other utilities, retail and grocery, public works, parks, access, etc; and (c) **does not externalize costs of development to the County** by forcing taxpayers to unnecessarily subsidize the high density (in particular) of what could be a perfectly reasonable low-density development.