

September 30, 2026

Knoxville-Knox County Planning
City-County Building, Suite 403
400 Main Street, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Re: Opposition to Case #10-G-26-RZ – 637 S. Gallaher View Road

Dear Members of the Knoxville-Knox County Planning Commission:

I live on Sabre Drive, and travel on S. Gallaher View Road past this property multiple times every day. I do not believe Planning staffs' analysis adequately establishes that all of the requirements under Article 6.30.01 have been satisfied, especially the requirements that the amendment be necessary because of substantially changed or changing conditions, and that no direct or indirect adverse effects result from the amendment.

Changing from A to PR does not increase the allowable residential density – all it does is grant greater development flexibility. While that may be desirable to the applicant, such does not demonstrate it is “necessary” because of substantially changed or changing conditions. The changing conditions that are most apparent to those of us who live here actually support greater caution, as opposed to greater flexibility. Additional apartment development is already underway 0.3 miles from this property, which will itself place additional vehicles onto Gallaher View Road. The cumulative effect of growth occurring along this corridor should be considered before granting even more development flexibility along a roadway that residents already experience as narrow, heavily traveled, and hazardous.

Furthermore, the significant environmental constraints identified by staff warrant greater scrutiny, not an assumption that rezoning will produce an environmental benefit. At this stage, the Commission should not treat the *potential* ability to cluster development as though it establishes a guaranteed environmental benefit of approving the requested rezoning today.

My foremost concern remains traffic and public safety. Staff concludes that the proposed rezoning is not anticipated to negatively impact the surrounding area and relies in part on the applicant's surveyor statement that sight distance is available on the south side of the property. While the sight-distance information is relevant, the appropriate question to ask at this stage is whether granting the additional development flexibility associated with PR zoning is appropriate on a property whose access is along a roadway with significant existing safety limitations, and whether the information presently in the record is sufficient to support the required conclusion that no direct or indirect adverse effects will result. Based upon the staff analysis, the cited sight-distance evaluation does not appear to address the broader cumulative conditions along this corridor: existing traffic volumes, crash history, the geometry and width of the roadway, increased traffic from nearby

development already under construction, or the effect of additional residential access and turning movements near this hill. Those are materially different questions from whether a particular point of access technically satisfies a sight-distance measurement. For residents who use Gallaher View Road every day, the condition of the entire roadway matters. There are foreseeable consequences that deserve meaningful consideration before the Commission concludes that rezoning to PR will produce no adverse effect.

Staff also cites the property's location within the Planned Growth Area, emphasizing the Growth Policy Plan's objectives of encouraging compact development, promoting economic growth, and providing a range of housing choices. Those are legitimate planning objectives. But the Growth Policy Plan describes another purpose of the Planned Growth Area as coordinating public and private action, particularly with respect to the provision of adequate roads, utilities, schools, drainage, and other public facilities and services.

That makes the existing condition of S. Gallaher View Road directly relevant. Growth should occur in conjunction with infrastructure capable of supporting it. A Planned Growth Area designation does not eliminate the need to examine whether the roadway serving a particular property is adequate for the development flexibility being requested.

Here, additional residential development is already occurring nearby. Before approving another change along this corridor, I respectfully ask the Commission to consider not merely whether residential development is generally contemplated in this part of Knox County, but whether the infrastructure serving this particular parcel is adequate under the conditions that actually exist today.

As a property owner and real estate investor myself, I fully support responsible residential development. However, I do not believe that every requested zoning should be approved or that every parcel is appropriate for development simply because additional units can technically be placed upon it... Location matters. Infrastructure matters. Topography matters. Public safety matters.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to deny the requested rezoning in Case #10-G-26-RZ.

If the Commission is not prepared to deny the request, I respectfully ask that it refrain from relying upon assumptions concerning a future development plan to resolve concerns that are relevant to the rezoning decision presently before it. In particular, I ask the Commission to ensure that the existing record adequately supports the required findings concerning the necessity for this zoning amendment, roadway safety, direct and indirect adverse effects, and the environmental advantages being attributed to PR zoning.

If PR zoning is ultimately approved, I further ask the Commission to consider appropriate protections ensuring that substantial clearing or grading does not occur before the required development plan has been reviewed, so that the property's steep slopes, stream corridor, tree canopy, access, and circulation can receive meaningful consideration through

the process established for those issues. Knox Planning has used this type of rezoning-stage condition in other PR cases involving significant environmental constraints.

The fact that both the existing Agricultural zoning and the requested PR zoning allow up to approximately 1 du/ac does not make the zoning classifications interchangeable, and it does not answer whether changing this particular property's zoning satisfies the standards applicable to this rezoning.

I respectfully ask that the Commission give substantial weight to the safety of the people who travel this road every day, the adequacy of the infrastructure serving this property, the environmental limitations of the site, and the long-term consequences for the surrounding community.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these concerns.