

**Planning Commissioner's Written Comments  
August 12, 2014**

**Hanover Pointe Sub Area C (Z1400004)**

**Ms. Bielen**

I vote approval.

**Ms. Davis**

Vote Approval

**Mr. Gibbs**

Voted to approve zoning change. Would prefer it remained a "natural area" but this was a request to develop and could be done. Will be interesting to see, from more detailed grading plans, how the stream buffer area is handled (grading, run-off from site, etc.) and how 41 units are sited. ?

**Mr. Harris**

The 2 dead-end streets connection would be beneficial (to me but residents feel differently on this) regardless of the development.

**Ms. Huff**

Yes Voted.

I voted to approve this rezoning because it downsizes the number of units per acre. However what we heard from community members and what can be seen from looking at the area is that the infrastructure is poor. Connectivity between the proposed development and major roads involves driving a circuitous route through neighborhoods some of whose streets are narrow and cramped. Routes in and out are limited. One "road" that could offer an additional way in or out goes into a creek.

**Mr. Miller**

As density in the area increases, the pressure on these inadequate roads will also increase, thus making walking where there are no sidewalks hazardous. For instance none of the residential streets to the north and east of this development have sidewalks. Access to the area by emergency vehicles seems problematic to me. With the addition of this development it is my opinion that the Rich Rd./McLamb Dr. connection should be improved up to Holder and a culvert installed where Rich Rd. goes into the creek. Sidewalks should exist along any road that makes up the main travel route through the area. This should be the responsibility of the state.

I voted in favor of this rezoning because it removes a remote transportation commitment from the development plan that had become obsolete in the course of events. I note that the density for the project will actually fall from 4.76 units per acre to the lowest density consistent with the comprehensive plan in the area – 4 units per acre. The property contains a creek, wetlands, areas

prone to flooding and, steep slopes. The development plan clusters development away from these problem areas. Some neighbors expressed concerns about traffic and buffers. As a general rule, I do not see the need to buffer single family homes from single family homes (I acknowledge that there could be a reason for such buffering, but I do not see it here). The traffic will change somewhat for these neighbors, but the project is being built at the least intensity called for by the comprehensive plan and the traffic it creates will be divide between access roads from two directions.

**Mr. Whitley**  
**Mr. Winders**

I voted to approve.

The road pattern is a mess! How did this labyrinth happen? But development plan is consistent with plan and policies.