

Robin Reinhart

From: Tracey Lockett <tetlockett@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 10, 2023 8:26 AM
To: Robin Reinhart; Mom Taclik; Tracey Lockett
Subject: RE: H-22-86

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

April 10, 2023

To Whom It May Concern
RE: FILE NUMBER H=22-86

I have lived in Hernando County for 40 years and have seen many changes for growth.

I am very concerned about the rezoning from agricultural to planned development that is listed for Pottersfield Garden Acres off of Winter Street.

I have several lots that back up to this new proposed development. I am concerned there will be no buffer between the homes on Cresap and the new development. This will certainly impact the drainage, well water, and site for septic systems.

I hope the Board will consider seeking a review prior to any decisions made with regard to the new development.

Respectfully,

Magdalen Taclik

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Robin Reinhart

From: Barbara Gugliotti <bkgugliotti@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, April 9, 2023 9:16 PM
To: Robin Reinhart; Planning Resource Object
Subject: Rezoning for Parcels 346165 and 346227

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Hernando County Planning and Zoning Commissioners,

My husband and I live in the neighborhood that borders the proposed developments on Parcels 346165 and 346227 which are under consideration for rezoning at the April 10, 2023 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. We are a diverse neighborhood in every aspect, but very a unified community when it comes to neighborhood safety, preserving the character of our neighborhood, and looking out for one another – the type of neighborhood community that I would think Hernando County wants to encourage. This is evidenced by the fact that within hours of receipt of the County’s Notice of Public Hearing that was sent to a small fraction of the homeowners in our neighborhood late last week, most those homes that did not receive notice were aware.

Our neighborhood is not anti-development, but we do have some concerns and questions regarding the proposed development, the Planning and Zoning Staff Report, as well as some suggestions.

Concerns:

1. **Access:** Sole access to the development on Jernigan Street takes traffic through and will increase traffic through the south end of our neighborhood, as well as create potential health and safety issues for both our neighborhood and future residents of the new development. As an example, just this year we experienced an accident that blocked access into and out of our neighborhood, that could have proven tragic had there been a need for an ambulance or fire truck within our neighborhood.

Question/Recommendation: Why is Summer Street not being considered for access to the new development since its end abuts the proposed development? Additionally, Langworthy Drive, which is referenced in both the application package and the Staff Report, ends due north of the proposed development and could be connected to create the type of “grid network” that is common in most municipal codes, as well as provide access both north and south for the proposed development. While its may not be the developer’s responsibility to complete the connection of Summer and Langworthy, the County could cost share this grid completion with the developer, as it will benefit the both parties.

2. **Traffic Congestion:** Traffic congestion at Winter Street and State Road 50 is currently quite heavy and there have been an increased number of accidents recently.

Question/Request: Will there be a formal traffic study conducted, and what plans are being considered to deal with the increased traffic, that the developer references using tables from the ITE manual? Our neighborhood would prefer that a study be performed and remedies for additional traffic and congestion be addressed PRIOR to the start of land clearing and construction.

3. **Density:** The application for rezoning suggests and the Public Notice states that the proposed development will be 39 single family homes on 0.4-acre lots.

Request: Our neighborhood consulted with professionals in the area of planning and zoning, and we were advised that it is not uncommon for applications for development to change after they are submitted. In an effort to maintain the character of our neighborhood we would like assurances that the 0.4-acre lots with single family homes will not increase in density or change from single family homes.

4. **Buffer:** The application for variance and Staff Report both indicate buffers along the Suncoast Parkway, and the along the north and south of the parcels, but no buffer along the east (despite the map included with the application denoting a buffer), where our neighborhood is located. Additionally, the application indicates that the only separation along the eastern boundary is a County 15-foot right-of-way, that the developer plans to pursue vacation of, leaving no separation between our neighborhood and the development.

Question/Request: Why is the County not requiring a buffer between our neighborhood and the proposed development, but agreeing to or requiring buffers on all other borders? Our neighborhood does not agree with the vacation of the County right-of-way behind the properties on Cresap Street (if it does indeed exist), and wants a buffer between our neighborhood and the proposed development.

5. **Stormwater Retention:** Currently the properties zoned as agricultural that border between our neighborhood and the Suncoast Parkway allow for the percolation of rainwater into the aquifer and absorption of stormwaters. Alteration of these parcels will decidedly have an impact on stormwater treatment. The application for rezoning states that “the project will be reviewed for drainage improvements and its effect on neighboring lands by Hernando County and the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD).”

Request: Since this is not mentioned in the Staff Report, our neighborhood would like assurances from the County that SWFWMD will conduct a drainage review PRIOR to lot clearing and construction to ensure rainwater that that percolates through the soil will not contaminate the aquifer or cause flooding in our neighborhood. We would also like assurances that the proposed onsite retention pond will be adequate to protect our neighborhood, as well as the development and other surrounding properties from flooding.

6. **Wildlife Survey:** The Staff Report states that “A comprehensive floral (vegetative) and faunal (wildlife) survey shall be prepared by a qualified professional.” The application indicates that “The developer will conduct a wildlife assessment.”

Request: As there are numerous Gopher tortoise (a threatened species that is also identified as a crucial keystone species) that reside in the subject parcels; in addition to numerous other wildlife (deer, turkey, fox, bobcat, coyote, owls, numerous songbirds, etc.) that use the parcels for feeding, breeding, and passage to other areas, we would ask that the developer be required to conduct an assessment by a qualified professional BEFORE any lot clearing or construction begins. On that note we have reached out to locate a qualified professional and have a name of someone who does this for a living that we would like to submit.

7. **Septic Systems:** It is indicated that septic systems will be installed in the proposed development.

Request: Our neighborhood would like an assurance from the County that a SWFWMD review of the proposed septic systems’ impact to water quality in the area will be conducted, including the aquifer which feeds many of our wells.

8. **HOA:** The application states there will be no HOA, but the Staff Report references an HOA with covenants and restrictions in several places.

Question: Please clarify. Will there be an HOA for this development?

9. **Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses:** The Staff Report description of the Surrounding Zoning & Land Uses is INCORRECT. It references an area 6 miles south (per MapQuest) of the parcels proposed for rezoning.

Request: We would like to be assured that no elements of the Staff Report/Recommendations are reference another rezoning application and that they are appropriate for this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara and James Gugliotti