

Green Hills Community Plan: 2005 Update
Proposed Plan Amendment for Valerie Crossings
Summary of Comments Sheets

1. I agree with the Proposed Policy of Conservation.
(Preservation and restoration of environmentally sensitive features)

If “yes” please explain your reasons for **considering** the proposed Conservation policy.

- Low Density is fine.
- Would like to see green space preserved.
- I like the idea of a small park. Can part of it become a wider Abbott Martin?
- Its good design responsibility and people appreciate having area like parks that they can directly use!
- This will not happen in isolation. Preservation of low-density residential use is important. But if (there is) more density, then conservation should be included.
- (This) Will improve the image of the neighborhood by creating a buffer and sidewalks.
- The restoration and protection of green space is essential to maintaining a pleasant living environment.
- Green space is important.
- Environment must be protected.
- Green Hills currently has a minimal amount of space designated for “green resting” spaces. An area for walking in nature and for gentle recreation would enhance this area.
- Improves flood plain situation; cleans creek around building site; provides green space for the community.

If “no”, please explain your reasons for **not considering** the proposed Conservation policy.

- No comment given.
- No comment given.
- No increase in traffic.
- These policies have been “oversold” in an effort to encourage buy-in from the neighborhood. We would gladly do without the proposed park, sidewalks, realignment of Cross Creek and Bedford Avenue, so long as there was no increase in the total number of units allowed by current zoning.
- This 3.3 acres is too small. It also belies the term “conservation” because 2 units can be built in this area. Sugar Creek “pathway” (greenway) is disingenuous. Who is going to (pay) the bill to cross over Abbott Martin?
- An environmentally sensitive area – the “development” appears to be much too large to return to a more natural condition.

Green Hills Community Plan: 2005 Update
Proposed Plan Amendment for Valerie Crossings
Summary of Comments Sheets

2. I agree with the Proposed Policy of T5 Center Mixed Use Neighborhood.
(Urban in Character, Mixed Use, Office, Retail, and Residential)

If “yes” please explain your reasons for **considering** the proposed T5 Center Mixed Use Neighborhood policy.

- Green Hills is a retail hub and can support more people.
- As density / population increases, it makes more sense to decrease building footprints and preserve neighborhoods.
- (It is an) appropriate use adjacent to (the) mall area.
- No comment given.
- Tightens the design of an area already RAC / RLM.

If “no”, please explain your reasons for **not considering** the proposed T5 Center Mixed Use Neighborhood policy.

- No comment given.
- No comment given.
- No increase in traffic; commercial.
- *(These comments address questions 2, 3, and 4. Comments A and B were paraphrased) **A.** Reviewed the Green Hills Community plan and the UDO prior to purchasing a home in area, and did so thinking no major changes would be made to the neighborhood. Allowing the RAC policy to expand to increase density would fundamentally change the character of the Cross Creek/Warfield/Caylor community. **B.** It does not make sense to increase density without first improving access (road, public transit, and sidewalks). Traffic is a nightmare and will only get worse. The idea of a walkable community is popular, but it will not happen in Green Hills anytime soon. The use of large scale mass transit use may not occur for years to come. People may walk for short errands but may still drive for daily needs (driving to work/school/church/after school activities, etc.) The result will be increase traffic as a result of increased housing density. **C.** The proposed / floor building is out of character with the rest of Green Hills and sets a horrible precedent for the future. Currently the only building > 3 floors is the eyesore known as the “Teachers Building”, and most buildings in Green Hills (even in the UDO/RAC) are two floors. Why on earth would anyone want more concrete jungle, higher density, and less sunlight? **D.** The T3 area proposed by planning staff is further evidence of slow bites being taken out of neighborhoods. In our opinion there should be no T3 area and the developer should have to provide for the transition zone on the East side of Cross Creek. He could do so by making the brownstones 2 floors instead of the proposed 3, and setting them back from the road more than currently proposed. **E.** We are uncomfortable with the proposed T3 area especially because we face part of it and there are no concrete details as to what could be built there in the future.
- Would add too much traffic to Abbott Martin.
- Opposed because T5 density is too high and includes non-residential uses. This area should remain residential, low density, to keep traffic and congestion under control.
- Too dense. Goals of walking and socio-economic heterogeneity are abstractions; access to Green Hills is likely to be by car for (the) foreseeable future. Commitment to low density residential is the existing expectation.
- 20 to 60 density is too intense. Up to 20 stories allowed is not acceptable.
- This density is too intense.
- I am most concerned about the proposed increased density of population and cars in this area. I also wonder how water, sewer and other utility services will adequately be provided. How many new students will (be added) to our local schools? Traffic is awful at times on Abbott Martin.
- 162 units on 2.7 acres! Traffic! Planning commission presented a sales pitch for this. Density not addressed. Not a single negative was mentioned.
- Very concerned as to building heights – max 20 story buildings?? No way. The area specified is already much too close to intense centers for what developers want to do. Before anything is done, traffic needs to be addressed.

Green Hills Community Plan: 2005 Update
Proposed Plan Amendment for Valerie Crossings
Summary of Comments Sheets

3. I agree with the Proposed Policy of T4 Urban Neighborhood Evolving
(Urban in character, mixture of housing types)

If “yes” please explain your reasons for **considering** the proposed T4 Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy.

- My house adjoins property on Cross Creek and I do not believe it will hurt any value.
- Adds needed housing (and) high density to the neighborhood.
- I would like this be heavily landscaped.
- Again the concentration of cars entering/using Abbott Martin concerns me. I do like the transition “character” of the T4 description.
- The proposed outlined by the developer will enhance the overall beauty and usefulness of the property.

If “no”, please explain your reasons for **not considering** the proposed T4 Urban Neighborhood Evolving policy.

- Once the residents of Green Hills leave the mall and other commercial districts, they want the sanctity of a private home.
- No comment given.
- No comment given.
- No increase in traffic, commerce.
- ** See comment above in question 2.
- Too much traffic on Abbot Martin.
- T4 would allow apartments, inappropriate density and (it is) negative to the neighborhood. Traffic is already a problem (and) this will make it worse. This is not an evolving neighborhood, it is well established.
- Keep single family residential if possible. Guard against creep of Green Hills shopping area into residential areas. Bedford is an (illegible). This proposal goes too far.
- 6 to 40 density is too intense.
- A maximum of 40 density is not acceptable.
- 68 units on 1.7 acres. Density and traffic. “Walkability” is good concept but only if residents are prohibited from having cars or visitors with cars.
- Traffic. Omit 20 story buildings!

Green Hills Community Plan: 2005 Update
Proposed Plan Amendment for Valerie Crossings
Summary of Comments Sheets

4. I agree with the Proposed Policy of T3 Suburban Neighborhood Evolving
(Suburban in character, mixture of housing types)

If “yes” please explain your reasons for **considering** the proposed T3 Suburban Neighborhood Evolving policy.

- Green Hills is evolving and it is good.
- Creates (an) appropriate buffer to suburban type housing.
- I would like to see protections in place to maintain mostly single family homes in this area.
- This would permit some increase in density but not like T5 (getting close though!)
- I believe this will happen sooner or later and is more cost effective to be changed along with other proposals.

If “no”, please explain your reasons for **not considering** the proposed T3 Suburban Neighborhood Evolving policy.

- This sounds like a way to increase housing density. Go walk around some of these Green Hills neighborhoods and you’ll understand.
- No comment given.
- It’s a slippery slope which will lead to ever increasing density rezoning – a domino effect.
- No.
- ** See comment above in question 2.
- Too much traffic on Abbot Martin.
- T3 density of 3 to 20 units per acre is too high for this area. Should remain RLM. This is an established neighborhood, not an evolving neighborhood.
- This is more (of a) slippery slope problem. NOT enough, if any consideration of broader regional concerns or ALTERNATIVES. Look at access to Green Hills, traffic impacts, and case for the need for this proposal.
- No changes should be made. The residents in the neighborhood overwhelmingly oppose this development.
- T3 for the adjacent property will lead to creeping further and further toward Abbottsford’s 176 homes.
- “Evolving” being the key word. A “just in case” addendum tacked on my Metro Planning.

Green Hills Community Plan: 2005 Update
Proposed Plan Amendment for Valerie Crossings
Summary of Comments Sheets

Miscellaneous Comments

- ❑ I participated in the original Subarea 10 Plan (Green Hills – Midtown) and this is an appropriate amendment.
- ❑ I support this plan and I am impressed with the proposed development.
- ❑ This looks good at first glance in the presentation, however, if there are genuine concerns for the well-being of Green Hills development, then start with the existing problems. For instance, the intersections of Richard Jones Road to Hillsboro Pike and Abbot Martin to Hillsboro need to be better organized. The blight of the shopping center due east of Abbott Martin to Hillsboro could take on a look similar to Hill Place while resolving that intersection at the same time. (Sketch included)
- ❑ Do not approve or recommend approval of this project. The traffic is backed up from the light at Abbott Martin and Hillsboro Circle to Bedford Avenue most days and during real busy times, it will back up to Cross Creek and beyond. This project will add 300 to 400 additional cars to the area. Listen to the neighbors of the project.
- ❑ Green Hills is already at capacity traffic wise. This development will benefit no one but the builder. Green Hills does not need or want Valerie Crossings.
- ❑ I would defer consideration of this rezoning and plan change until a comprehensive review of plan is possible. Also the planning department must be careful about imposing its abstract values on the community through a truncated process. Further the design strategy is not likely to succeed. Some thing the buildings on the west reflect good planning. They are not – (they have) no setback. Seven stories is too tall and density overall is too great based on what I heard. Please look at the access to Green Hills' problem and what alternatives exist and what is going on elsewhere in Green Hills and other areas. And please (address) how this sits with Bedford Commons and other similar developments. Finally we should be careful about making long-term judgments based on short-term market conditions. For example access to mortgage funds for condo and single family residential purchases. As for the renters vs. owner issues, there is no slam on renters, only recognition that renting vs. owning brings different levels of financial commitment to an area.
- ❑ The development is strongly opposed by the majority of neighborhood residents within ½ mile.
- ❑ Why has the market changed so much from the plan of 2005? Rental property in our neighborhoods should not be decided by others.
- ❑ My answer is the same to all four questions. Abbott Martin Rd is not capable of handling 600 more cars (2 cars per 300 homes) particularly when you consider the fact there are still several more office blocks to be built right opposite in the Bedford Place. Not to mention the fact that several of the current office buildings in Bedford Place are half empty right now. Once the economy improves however, they are going to be filled and new buildings will be built in the spaces, adding hundreds of people and cars. On busy days if you are trying to turn left onto Abbott Martin Road from Cross Creek the traffic is lined up across the junction and up the hill on Abbott Martin, making it impossible to pull out and turn left. Adding 600 cars would create a nightmare on Abbott Martin Road. Widen Abbott Martin at that point by adding one more lane PLUS make it legal to turn right on red at the stoplight where Abbott Martin meets Hillsboro Circle and I would vote for the project. Otherwise, it s a big NO in my book for what that's worth.
- ❑ 1. I fail to see a time for this plan. 2. The site for which amendments are requested is much too intense and dense. 3. The main thrust of the developer regarding traffic and Abbott Martin – Hillsboro Circle intersection, that of making a right turn lane eastbound on Abbott Martin, leaving only the inside lane for a left or straight ahead would immensely improve traffic flow was absolutely unbelievable! It would only make it much worse. 4. I live in a very walkable 3.4 of a mile from the area being discussed – that is if I had a “death wish”. Living west of said development a sidewalk of about 20 to 15 feet gets me started on to the shoulder of Abbott Martin east to Green Hills. Long story short, I would have to drive to Green Hills and park my car to take advantage of Green way, sidewalks and so forth. I don't think this is part of the plan. 5. Lastly assuming all apartments and townhomes were rented, that would be at least 650 -700 cars daily.