

I am continually amazed (though I shouldn't be at this point) that KPC/Knox County seemingly rubber stamps and proposal by developers, especially in granting variances, especially those that were not previously discussed when this plan first was approved.

I'm especially concerned at Aaron Fritts' statement in his email dated 1/4/22 (page 11 of the case file) regarding how the variances requested will not have any injurious effect to the public or create unsafe conditions.

Mr. Fritts should be called before your body and required to explain how this is his finding, rather than submit a one paragraph email essentially saying trust me.

It's also concerning that Mr Smith, as a member of the KPC, has this plan before the committee. Not only are you granting his variance and increasing dwelling units from the original recommendation, but you are adding houses with driveways directly onto the main exit of an existing neighborhood, and in a position on this road not in keeping with the neighborhood in general. When this request initially came before this body, the plan was for one entrance into this proposed neighborhood, not 6. These driveways represent a significant hazard to the new homeowners, not to mention disrupts traffic flow for the other residents on Mission Hill. The reason he is requesting these variances is because he cannot get the houses to fit unless he does. So he takes the "design it like I want it and make all the other legal stuff fit around my design" approach

Mr Smith's obvious conflict of interest, as well as this body's refusal to seriously consider concerns of existing residents previously is extraordinarily reckless. He did meet with a group of residents but could not have cared less what their concerns were. These requests for variances are "exhibit a" of this attitude.

The obviously reason is that Mr. Smith wants as many dwelling units as he can, and KPC seems to be happily accommodating his every wish. He knows - as well as everyone who is reading his plans and design - that he can't get the extra 5 houses in his neighbor if he doesn't have access to Mission Hill for these driveways. , namely due to the buffers noted on page 8 of the case file. If he were not to get access to Mission Hills with these 5 driveways, He would lose buildable space within the property he owns. But he knew of these buffers when he purchased the property. Now he is trying to salvage the deal and extract as much as possible from the land.

The committee should vote against granting these variances, and require mr smith to go back to the neighbors around the land that he owns and in good faith discuss their concerns. He made significant changes to his concept plan approval, as noted under comments section on page 2 of your case file, and now he is asking you to overlook these changes without requiring him to submit a new concept design plan.

Michael Douglas