An excerpt from the comment section of the report:

"This proposal is for a 102-lot detached residential subdivision on 25 acres. The subject property was part of a 73-acre site rezoned to PR (Planned Residential) 1-2.5 du/ac in 2005 that was all under the same ownership as the current applicant (11-B-05-RZ). Over time, the applicant sold off approximately 47 acres. In 2020, a concept plan was approved for this same property and it was determined that the applicant still retains the development rights to the density on the acreage that was sold (1-SE-20-C / 1-I-20-UR). Because of this, the gross density for entire PR district is approximately 1.5 du/ac (110 lots on approx. 73 acres). The net density for the subject site is approximately 4.08 du/ac (102 lots on approx. 25 acres)."

If there are only 25 actual acres and the parcel is zoned for 2.5 du/acre, shouldn't there only be 62 homes permitted? How is it ok that the developer retains the development rights on the acreage that was sold? With that logic, the acreage that was sold should have zero homes permitted, correct? That would only make sense if all of the homes for the sold acreage are being crammed onto the remaining 25 acre parcel.

Secondly, as you are examining the "...several variances and alternative design standards," requested by the applicant, how does the warped du/ac play into those decisions? The report references the property being rezoned to 2.5 du/acre multiple times, however, it is truly 4.08 du/acre if you are allowing them to retain the original development rights, which doesn't really seem to make sense for this originally zoned AG property. Why are you not stating everywhere in the report that it is 4.08 du/acre?

The way this report is written and the way this case is being handled appears shady, unethical and favor the developer, not the community, AGAIN. I look forward to hearing how you address this concern.