I am writing in regards to PC 25-18: request by American Structurepoint for approval of a minor modification to Development Plan 2023-2379 (Redwood at Addison Farms) to amend the approved buffer mound and landscaping plan.

I am a resident of the Oakhurst subdivision, on Sylvan Drive.

A few years ago my neighbors invested a good deal of time working with the Planning Commission, City Staff and City Council to address concerns about how the Addison Development would impact adjacent property owners. One of the issues discussed was adding a privacy buffer on the north side of the development, between the row house apartments and the Oakhurst neighborhood. The compromise settled on was an 8' high mound topped by staggered rows of 6' evergreen trees, which was deemed sufficient to provide a visual screen between the two subdivisions.

The requested height reduction of this mound (to 3' with 6' trees) will not be adequate to provide the barrier negotiated in the original agreement.

I watched the recording of the January 7th meeting of the Planning Commission, and I can appreciate that there may be concerns with tree health on an 8' mound. But this should have been discussed in the initial stages of the planning process. Planning Commission reports dated December 15, 2021 and August 2, 2023 both refer to construction of an 8' high barrier, including provisions made to protect existing trees. I am unclear why the City and the Developer would have agreed to this without an understanding of the property boundaries, existing tree stock, and engineering challenges posed by the site.

I am concerned that agreements were made at that time without sufficient reflection or follow through, knowing that any agreement could be easily reneged on, without enforcement or consequence, at a later date.

At this point, any proposed changes brought by the City or the Developer should offer the same level of privacy that would be afforded by an 8' mound with trees.

I hope that the Commission will delay voting on this request for modification until a solution can be found that will satisfy the intent of the original agreement.

(As a final note: in the January 7th Planning Commission meeting, it was stated that City Staff would send notice to residents about the requested change to residents "in the vicinity." I am not sure how "vicinity" was defined, but I do not recall receiving any such notice on Sylvan.)

Thank you,

Mary Ellen Kelly