From:	Dzgdoan Gmail
To:	Apgar, Kaitlyn
Subject:	Objection to Z2025-016 (Tatra Townhomes Rezone) – Density, Traffic, Cost, and Land Use Concerns
Date:	Friday, June 26, 2026 4:35:32 PM

Dear Ms. Apgar,

I am writing as a property owner within the 1,500-foot notice radius for the Tatra Townhomes Rezone (Case Z2025-016) to formally object to this request to rezone approximately 11.97 acres from A-1 (Agriculture) to R-3A (Multiple Family Dwelling) for 70 townhome units. I own property at 2540 Morning Star.

1. The density increase is excessive for this site.
A-1 is one of the county's lowest-intensity zoning classifications, intended for agricultural and very low-density use. R-3A is one of the most intensive residential classifications in the code. Rezoning directly from one extreme to the other, with no intermediate step, is a disproportionate jump that does not reflect the rural, low-density character of the surrounding area. A development consistent with the site's current context, in the range of 8 to 10 single-family homes, would be a far more appropriate transition than 70 multi-family units.

2. Chapman Rd and SR 426 cannot absorb this traffic.
Chapman Rd is classified by the county itself as a minor roadway, not designed to carry significant through-traffic. Based on standard trip-generation rates for multifamily housing, 70 units would add roughly 400-450 additional daily vehicle trips onto Tatra St and Chapman Rd, nearly all of which would funnel into the already-strained Chapman Rd/SR 426 (Aloma Ave) intersection. The county and FDOT are already funding major capacity upgrades elsewhere on this same corridor (the SR 417 widening at Aloma Ave and the planned Slavia Road widening) because growth has outpaced this road network's design capacity. No comparable improvement is proposed here, and the application includes no plan to address this.

3. The developer must fund 100% of the road infrastructure costs this project creates — not a shared or proportionate-share split with existing taxpayers.
Road widening and intersection upgrades made necessary by private development are frequently funded in part through county-wide gas tax revenue, MSTU assessments, or future bond measures, which means existing property owners end up covering part of a cost that a private developer's project created. I am explicitly asking that this not be a "proportionate share" arrangement in which the public absorbs any portion of the bill. The full cost of any road widening, turn lanes, signal upgrades, or other infrastructure made necessary by this development — at the Chapman Rd/Tatra St intersection, the Chapman Rd/SR 426 intersection, and any other affected segment — should be funded entirely by the applicant/developer as a condition of approval, with no portion charged to the county's general fund, gas tax revenue, or any future MSTU or bond assessment on existing residents.

4. The rental and jobs picture doesn't support this density.
This area has seen a steady increase in proposed rental and multifamily projects without a corresponding increase in local jobs. Adding rental supply without proportional employment

growth nearby tends to produce longer commute patterns, adding commuter traffic to Chapman Rd and SR 426 rather than relieving local demand.

5. The intended occupancy of these units needs to be clarified and restricted.
The application does not specify whether these 70 units will be long-term residential rentals or could be operated as short-term/transient rentals (e.g., Airbnb-style). Short-term rental use would bring materially different impacts than standard residential leasing, including higher turnover traffic, parking strain, and absentee-owner management. I am requesting that, at minimum, any approval include a deed restriction or development order condition prohibiting short-term/transient rental use and requiring minimum lease terms consistent with long-term residential occupancy.

6. The HOA model being introduced does not fit an area that is, and should remain, agricultural in character, and HOA accountability in Florida has become a real problem that this approval should not repeat.
Standard HOA covenants for developments like this typically mandate intensive turf-grass maintenance: frequent mowing, fertilization, and routine herbicide and pesticide applications to meet uniform landscaping appearance standards. Imposing that kind of chemical-dependent lawn-care regime across 11.97 acres that are currently agricultural land runs directly against the rural, low-input character of the surrounding area and raises real concerns about fertilizer and pesticide runoff into the surrounding soil and water systems.

More broadly, Florida HOAs in developments like this frequently operate with very little accountability: they collect mandatory fees and levy fines on individual homeowners for minor cosmetic violations, while the HOA itself is not consistently held to the same standard for maintaining the common areas, retention ponds, and shared infrastructure it is responsible for. Residents end up paying for upkeep that does not happen. I have also seen HOA-controlled irrigation and landscaping practices that do not consistently follow county water-use restrictions, including watering schedules and water sources that bypass the same conservation rules individual homeowners are required to follow.

I am asking that any approval require: (a) a documented, county-enforceable common-area maintenance standard, so that residents paying mandatory HOA fees and facing fines are not also left with unmaintained shared facilities; (b) a binding requirement that all landscaping and irrigation for this development fully comply with the county's water-use restrictions, with no exemption for HOA-controlled common areas; and (c) a prohibition on mandatory chemical fertilizer, herbicide, or pesticide covenants. New developments nearby have already shown this exact pattern of poorly structured, poorly enforced HOAs, and this project should not be allowed to repeat it.

For all of these reasons, I respectfully ask the Commission to deny this rezone request as submitted. If the Commission is not inclined to deny it outright, I ask that it not be approved without all of the following conditions:
1. A substantial reduction in unit count to a density consistent with the surrounding low-density/agricultural character of the area (on the order of single-family development rather than 70 multifamily units).
2. An updated traffic impact study and a signal warrant/turn-lane analysis at the Chapman Rd/Tatra St and Chapman Rd/SR 426 intersections.
3. 100% developer-funded infrastructure mitigation for all roadway and intersection improvements made necessary by this project, with no cost-sharing or proportionate-share

burden placed on existing taxpayers.
4. A binding restriction prohibiting short-term/transient rental use of the units.
5. A documented, county-enforceable HOA common-area maintenance standard; a binding requirement that all HOA-controlled landscaping and irrigation comply fully with county water-use restrictions; and a prohibition on mandatory chemical fertilizer, herbicide, or pesticide covenants.

Please enter this letter into the record for the hearing on this matter.

Sincerely,
Dung Doan