

From: [Steve Van Maren-x](#)
To: [Mike Wilcox](#); [Jake Warner](#)
Cc: [Brian McCuistion](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments to the Planning Commission 4/21/22
Date: Friday, April 22, 2022 7:23:00 AM

Gentle persons,

Item 1: no comment

2: High Pointe Shopping Center Sign Theme: The materials do not show where the three signs are located. The updating of the signs will look nicer. Otherwise, the application seems to specify taller signs than allowed.

-- after driving by behind the tour bus, I see there a total of 4 small sign locations. (one on 7800 East)

3. Sunrise Ridge Rezone:

1) too bad this is warranted; care facilities are needed too.

2) PUD 4.75 would be closer to the existing neighborhood than 12 residences to the acre. I ask that you reduce the density. This is at least 3 blocks from State street, the closest street ready to handle traffic increases.

4. Sugarcreek Rezone:

1) I like R-1-10 zoning. It has done great things for Sandy's growth.

2) While not the time now, but as the city works with the applicant, I hope some units on these nice sized lots could be built at a lower cost to feed the entry level market. I am not asking for smaller lots.

5. Amendments to SD(R-2-A) Fluekiger District:

1) I believe I understand the intent. I have two issues with the specifications of the new Zone:

A) the largest lot is 18,000 sq. ft.; this does not justify the animal rights of R-1-20A for all four lots. Section (c).1.c should be R-1-15A as the closest existing Zone. The setbacks and other features of R-1-20 are very close, and the maximum house size is only 1000 square feet smaller.

B) and (c).1.b: this language is confusing to me. I think the intent is to provide a minimum of 10,000 square feet of buildable area on each lot, "for each dwelling and uses accessory thereto." When I read it, I thought it said the lots were required to be 10,000 square feet minimum; this is the standard for R-1-10, and not the intent here, I believe. Please add "of buildable area" before "shall" to the specification.

Thank you for listening.

Sorry for the late delivery, it was found on my computer when I returned home.

Steve Van Maren
Resident

From: [Wilde Journey](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Cy's road
Date: Wednesday, April 27, 2022 7:31:00 AM

My neighbors told me about the new neighborhood going in on the golf course please put in a wall like the one at Amphitheatre park to go across te property line and give the residents who have lived in the area next to golf course and open space field some privacy and quiet when the road is "improved". Thank you

From: [David Hackbarth](#)
To: [Dustin Fratto](#); [Jake Warner](#)
Cc: [David Hackbarth](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Sugarcreek rezone hearing comments
Date: Saturday, April 30, 2022 7:15:09 PM

Due to some obligations I will not be able to attend the meeting of May 10 and 17th , 2022 on this rezoning proposal.

So I wanted to submit my comments in writing. Thanks for putting this into the public record.

I am a long time resident of the adjacent neighborhood of Quarry Bend. I enjoy looking out my homes back windows to the greenery of the golf course. I consider it's open area a vital breath of fresh air for the community.

When Quarry Bend was developed, SIGNIFICANT concessions were required of the developers that SERVED the needs of the community. Examples are two ball very popular ball parks, open areas within the community, a very popular walking path, dog park, two water tanks preserving open space..... Standard expected amenities such as green belts, walking paths, dog parks, parks, ball diamonds are an integral and required part of our community. This is what makes a neighborhood an asset that strengthens our community and that people will take pride in. This should be MANDATORY for development proposals.

I see NONE of the standard amenities which would be expected of a development of such a size as in this proposal? How can this be acceptable to authorize rezoning for a beautiful open space?

So the 135 homes will come to the small overburdened dog park in the neighborhood on Harvard Park drive? Go take a look.

They only walkway is two short walks to access the existing pathway that was required when Quarry Bend was built? How is that acceptable?

They will come to the overly popular ball park and playground that was built for Quarry Bend? How is that acceptable?

Even the small park they are proposing doesn't happen until phase 3? What value is that?

The property owner also own land at the intersection of E. Quarry Bend Drive drive and 9000. This property should be contributed to the community for an extension of the already overburdened park at Quarry Bend.

My point is that the developer's proposal is clearly INADEQUATE to address the amenities that are expected of large developments such as this. It is UNACCEPTABLE that the developer even thinks that they can submit a plan for community review and rezoning with out specific and detailed community amenities. This should be IMMEDIATELY REJECTED and the developer should be forced to resubmit a reasonable first draft plan with specific detail that address the community needs, not just cramming the most houses they can into the property, a low ball approach which i find totally dishonorable to the community.

Please step up to protect the community interests and not the developers..... after all that is your job. Letting the rejoining go through without negotiating significant amenities is a dereliction of your duties. Make the developer commit to significant community amenities as part of the rezone approval!

Thanks for taking my input as part of public records on this project. Lets get this on track with appropriate concessions from the developer BEFORE AUTHORIZING REZONING!

David Hackbarth
dhack7@icloud.com
Mobile: 619-818-3149