

Submitted @ PEZ H0501
Public Comment

1 of 1
File #
H-25-01

Steven & Raysa Anderson

8390 Lake Hill Ct.
Spring Hill, FL 34608
andesol@yahoo.com

June 9, 2025

Hernando County Development Services Department
1653 Blaise Dr.
Brooksville, FL 34601

To whom it may concern,

When we decided to move to FL in 2022, we made an important list of "must have" features that our future home should have. We did not want to compromise on the inclusion of any of the "must have" items because we believed this would be our final home purchase. Having the property overlook a natural setting was one such "must have" on our list. Raysa took on the huge task of finding some properties that checked off all the "must haves", and we were lucky enough to find our current home at 8390 Lake Hill Ct.

Changing the zoning on the land behind our home from AR-2 to PDP(GC) and PDP(SF) would completely eliminate what is one of the finest features of our home: the beautiful back yard that's bounded only by nature. Once we saw it, we knew we had found our home.

To eliminate that feature of our home is to eliminate the feature that drew us there in the first place. It was so difficult to find, and it would be a shame for it to be gone so shortly after our purchase. Virtually every day of the week, we enjoy the beautiful views

of nature from our backyard. Among the trees and bushes just beyond our yard, we have seen gopher tortoises, rabbits, coyotes, and wild turkeys and numerous other species who also call this small, wooded area home. For the peace and safety of us all, please reconsider this proposed zoning change.

Sincerely yours,

Steven and Raysa Anderson

8390 Lake Hill CT
Spring Hill, FL 34608

Lynne E summers
199 Oak Lake Drive
Spring Hill FL 34608

Hernando County Planning Department
1653 Blaise Drive
Brooksville FL 34601



June 9, 2025

To the Zoning Department,

I attended the June 9th zoning hearing regarding File Number H-25-01 and took the opportunity to speak about the alarming traffic conditions on County Line Road and the serious environmental impact this development will bring. I fully understand that development is inevitable—but what I strongly object to is the lack of thoughtful, proactive planning from the county when it comes to these large-scale projects.

It's no secret that Hernando County has been trying for years to transfer jurisdiction of County Line Road to the state, but those efforts have been unsuccessful, leaving the road in what's still referred to as "yellow." What's more concerning is learning that essential infrastructure—such as fire departments—has not even been allocated for these expansive developments.

Where is the common sense? In many counties across the country, developers are required to share the burden of infrastructure. They must install turn lanes, additional road capacity that aligns with future highway plans, and even contribute to—or build—fire stations when developments exceed a certain size. That's just responsible planning, especially in a disaster-prone state like Florida.

Unfortunately, at the hearing, I was not permitted to offer rebuttal after my three minutes. So I'll offer it here. A representative for the zoning request stated that residents of this new community could make left turns onto County Line Road either from the new development's entrance or via Suncoast Blvd. That suggestion is not only naive—it's dangerous. It makes no difference what road you use to take a left onto County Line; it's a daily hazard.

Currently, residents in Rainbow Hills Estates cut through neighboring subdivisions just to reach Waterfall Road and access a traffic light. But even that is no solution—Waterfall is a narrow two-lane road with an inadequate turn lane. Drivers impatiently swerve onto the shoulder to pass left-turning vehicles, often without slowing down. This is already a recipe for disaster, and we haven't even added the volume from the proposed development.


It was also mentioned that a portion of the undeveloped dirt road, "Pot of Gold," will be paved to the east. Even if the developer attempts to block access through the remaining undeveloped

section, people will find a way through. We already see drivers going off-road to bypass traffic—they won't hesitate to go around a blockade.

Without Hernando County taking a lead role in planning critical infrastructure, we are paving the way to chaos. Traffic collisions, delayed emergency responses, and preventable tragedies will follow. It doesn't have to be this way. With real planning and true partnerships—where developers contribute to the infrastructure they benefit from—growth can happen in a responsible, community-first manner.

Let's not wait for a catastrophe to act. Let's plan like our safety depends on it—because it does.

Thank you for your time<

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lynne E. Summers'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name 'Lynne' being more prominent and the last name 'Summers' following in a similar style. The signature is written over the printed name 'Lynne E. Summers'.

Lynne E. Summers

Opposition to proposal based on planning and zoning standards

I am here today representing the Rainbow Hills Estates HOA which is a community on the northwest corner on the proposal.

I respectfully ask that you vote 'NO' on the proposed development on County Line Rd.

This plan conflicts with Hernando's Future Land Use Element, specifically strategies 1.10B4 and 1.11B4, which prioritize controlled, low-intensity growth to preserve rural character and address urban sprawl prevention. This area known as El Pico is largely rural/agricultural, or single family homes . Many of its residents came to the area to escape exactly this type of development. Adjacent AR-zoned properties lack adequate buffers to manage the abrupt shift to this high-density urban use. The proposed six-foot vinyl fencing fails to protect the rural visual character, violating buffering standards meant to soften such transitions. No wetland study or environmental impact assessment has been conducted, leaving potential ecological harm unaddressed, which is reckless given the area's natural features. The high density and impervious surface coverage will strain storm water management systems, heightening flood risks and damaging wildlife habitats

critical to local biodiversity. Noise and light pollution from this intense development will disrupt the quiet, rural lifestyle of nearby residents. Surrounding property values will likely decline due to this incompatible use, as it clashes with the area's established character. Strategies 1.04B4 and 1.04B5 of the Future Land Use plan emphasize protecting rural zones and ensuring compatible development, but this project disregards those principles, pushing an urbanized footprint that erodes the community's identity. This fits the definition of 'urban sprawl' that the county's own plan tries to prevent. Approving this would set a precedent for ignoring the county's own planning framework. This development, as proposed, must be rejected to uphold Hernando's land use standards.

Thank You,

Signed,

Robert Weaver

Residential Category

Objective 1.04B: The Residential Category allows primarily single family, duplex, resort and multi-family housing and associated ancillary uses such as recreational and institutional. Office and certain commercial uses may be allowed subject to the locational criteria and performance standards of this Plan. Residential density shall not exceed 22 dwelling units per gross acre.

Strategy 1.04B(1): Commercial and institutional uses within the Residential Category are generally associated with medium and high density residential development and may include neighborhood commercial, office professional, recreational, schools, and hospitals. Minor public facilities that do not unduly disturb the peaceful enjoyment of residential uses may also be allowed.

Strategy 1.04B(2): Future residential development will be planned to locate where the Residential Category predominates on the Future Land Use Map as determined by the availability of facilities and services, the need to accommodate future growth, the strategies to discourage the proliferation of urban sprawl, and the impacts to natural resources, including groundwater.

Single-Family Housing

Strategy 1.04B(3): The Residential Category will include zoning for single-family housing, generally averaging a density of 2.5 dwelling units per gross acre to 6.0 dwelling units per gross acre comprised of varying lot sizes and dwelling unit types such as senior housing, villa housing, single family detached housing, and zero lot line housing.

Multi-Family Housing

Strategy 1.04B(4): The Residential Category includes zoning for multi-family housing generally averaging 7.5 dwelling units per gross acre up to 22 dwelling units per gross acre in order to provide for a diversity of housing choices. Multifamily housing should be located within, or in close proximity to urban areas shown on the Adjusted Urbanized Area Map, or near shopping and employment centers or within Planned Development Projects.

Strategy 1.04B(5): High density zonings are intended for locations in the more intensely developed sections of the County. New residential development of high density housing shall utilize the Planned Development Project (PDP) process. Regulatory criteria shall

CPAM2202 - Proposed Revisions to the Future Land Use Element

Land Use Compatibility

Strategy 1.10 B (4): Review all land use applications for compatibility to include:

- a. Evaluation of existing uses of land, zonings, and Future Land Uses, including the existing and potential densities and intensities;
- b. Consideration of existing development patterns and approved development in the area;
- c. Evaluation of existing proposed and anticipated transitions between land uses;
- d. Consideration of environmental and cultural features and community characters;
- e. Appropriate timing based on the availability of adequate public facilities/services;
- f. Consistency with applicable specific area plans, corridor plans and redevelopment plans;
- g. Limitations on building height and/or use of increased setbacks; and
- h. Transition of density and intensity.


Strategy 1.10B (5): To promote compatible lot size and design and to mitigate potential incompatibilities, residential Master Plan applications will be reviewed for the following:

- a. Use of undisturbed native vegetation as a suitable buffer;
- b. Use of enhanced buffers to include supplemental trees and shrubs and/or perimeter fencing/walls;
- c. Requirements for increased opacity of screening on the site perimeter;
- d. Increased setbacks on the site perimeter;
- e. The placement of smaller lots internal to the site;
- f. The placement of larger lots, similar in size to adjoining lots, on the site perimeter;
- g. Increased width of buffers on the site perimeter;
- h. Limitations on density consistent with adjoining land uses;
- i. Gradual transition of density and lot size; and
- j. Proposed residential developments adjacent to residential uses shall demonstrate compatibility through the creation of a similar lot pattern, enhanced screening/buffering or other means. Maintenance and enhancement of rural, scenic, or natural view corridors shall also be a consideration in evaluating compatibility in this area.

Urban Sprawl Prevention

Strategy 1.11 B (4): The following information shall be required when considering rezoning requests in Rural neighborhoods:

- a. A narrative describing how the proposed development will maintain and/or protect the existing rural neighborhood, to include:
 1. An analysis of adjacent conditions and proposed development which illustrates protection of the rural character;
 2. An analysis of the existing roadway network and other infrastructure which demonstrates minimal impact;
 3. The applicant shall conduct one (1) neighborhood meeting prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing for citizen input on the proposed petition.

- 
4. A description of the methods proposed protecting rural neighborhoods from the impacts upon adjacent uses that may affect the long-term viability of those neighborhoods. The impacts to be analyzed include unwanted light, noise, physical access, odor, and other disruptions;
 5. An analysis of the impact upon, and compatibility with adjoining agricultural uses.; and
 6. The need to include a homeowners or deed restriction for lots in the development that the development is adjacent to agricultural uses

Good afternoon Commissioners. My name is Brett LaFreniere...*(spell last name)*, and I have been sworn in.

As a voice for 61 families of Rainbow Hills Estates, I'm here to express strong opposition to the proposed rezoning petition on County Line Road.

While the residents of Rainbow Hills understand the importance of economic growth, this proposal is incompatible with both current infrastructure realities and the county's long-term planning documents.

First, as identified by the Florida Senate's Local Funding Initiative Request #2528 for FY24-25, County Line Road is not just another roadway...it's a major east-west artery linking US-19 to the Suncoast Parkway to US-41. It serves a critical role in our regional transportation network and also functions as a designated emergency evacuation route. As indicated in the last Florida Department of Transportation Traffic Engineering Analysis in 2000, this section of road is already strained. FDOT identified it is operating at a Level-D and projected it would decline to a Level-F by 2025, the lowest rating on their scale. Significant traffic congestion, further wear-and-tear, and increased accidents will be a certainty if this project moves forward.

Second, the Metropolitan Planning Organization's Long Range Transportation Plan specifically calls for widening this section of County Line into four lanes with a sidewalk. However, the proposed development directly conflicts. As an example, the developer is requesting a setback deviation of 75 feet, reducing the County's planning setback by 50 feet. Approving this would either compromise that expansion or force costly redesigns, placing an unnecessary burden on taxpayers and further delaying necessary improvements.

Third, the county's Future Land Use Element, Section 1.08B, explicitly requires that new development along this stretch produce low to moderate trip generation rates. This policy is not just a suggestion-it's a guideline intended to protect the long-term functionality and safety of County Line Road. Currently, there are two segments of County Line that are only 2 lanes, one of those is directly in front of the proposed development! The total development's density and intensity of 170 townhomes, 15 apartments, etc. which brings a minimum planning factor of 378 more vehicles to this stretch of road, which will amplify an already congested roadway, worsen commuter travel time, and increase evacuation times. This level of density is completely out of scale with what is currently appropriate for the area.

Finally, approving this development would set a dangerous precedent: allowing incompatible projects to override long-term planning, public safety concerns, and existing land use policy. We owe it to our

residents-and our first responders-to make decisions that are not only forward-looking, but grounded in the principles we've already agreed to as a community.

We strongly urge you to deny this proposal and ask the applicant to bring forward a plan that aligns with both our infrastructure capacity and our long-term vision for the area.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

CR 578 (County Line Road) from east of East Road to Spring Time Street 257298-3-52-01

Project Details	
Work Type	Reconstruction
Phase	Design
Limits	From east of East Rd. to Spring Time St.
Length	2.6 miles
City	Spring Hill
County	Hernando Pasco
Road	County Line Rd
Design Cost	\$3.6M
ROW Cost	\$7M



About

This project will reconstruct CR 578 (County Line Road) from east of East Rd. to Spring Time St. from a two-lane road to a four-lane divided roadway along the border of Pasco and Hernando counties. A new sidewalk will be built on the north side and a shared-use path will be built on the south side of the road.

Right of way acquisition will be required for the roadway and drainage ponds.

The project is currently under design. Construction is not funded at this time.

Contact Information

Design Manager

Mary Lou Godfrey
813-981-3811
Marylou.Godfrey@dot.state.fl.us

Media Contact

Kris Carson
813-975-6060
Kristen.Carson@dot.state.fl.us

FDOT design 257298-3-52-01

SUNCOAST BLVD.

COUNTY LINE ROAD (CR 578)

