

City properties acquired in the past few years (Maps 1-3)	
These properties should be shown as Park, Greenbelt, or Conservation Easement	11
These properties should continue to be shown as single family residential use	1
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We like the large lot concept that the rest of the city residents enjoy. The Villas concept is too dense already. Don't add any more housing in this area. If SSV agreed to protect these properties from future development and no impervious cover is available. Then make into Conservation Conservation not park The City can't manage this much green space-we need to plan for more managed growth and development- can't become one big park. The battle call when developers wanted to over-develop the 263 ac weaver ranch and other parcels was simple. When it comes to land... when it's gone, it's gone. Citizens realized we did not have to be like austin, that we could choose our own destiny and we did. The citizens of sunset valley have supported careful development for an intelligent and thoughtful balance between our economic needs and a quality lifestyle in harmony with the natural resources that make us unique. This is why we bought these additional parcels. Nowhere did citizens say, "ohh, let's buy some more land with city funds and build more houses." Citizens did not want a resulting community that was simply an appendage to a mega-shopping zone, but rather a little city blessed by design with the income and resources to preserve and celebrate living in harmony with greenspaces, wildlife and our protected underground water zones. The challenge for the future is to continue to honor community over special interests and always looks to the future generations. N.b. there are still parts of the city that would benefit from the purchase of bits of land to buffer us from Austin, provide trail accesses, and protect our creeks and fallback municipal well water source, the Edwards aquifer. 	
City acquired property at 37 Lone Oak (Maps 4 and 5)	
This entire property should be shown as Park, Greenbelt, or Conservation Easement	4
This property should be shown as Park, Greenbelt, or Conservation Easement, except for an approximately 1 acre tract on the northern end to be retained as single family residential use.	8
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please sell the 1 ac tract and specify that the income will be used for other "green" purchases 37 Lone Oak should be divided to sell off a small single family lot The purchase of this property was within the context of a council adopted outline for land acquisition. Priority justifications were given to buying/aquiring creekside land to improve localized flooding/rapid rain run-off and 	

enhancing water quality by limiting additional floodzone construction (7.2k /ac) thereby protecting needed rain infiltration inventory. As a creekside property 37 lone oak qualified as such an acquisition. Selling off land and creating a non-compliant lot for an additional homestead would be counter to the original intention. Light use such as trailheads, light recreation for the citizens and citizen co-op organic orchards would be more appropriate. We should serve our citizens needs first. N.b. (elected officials with adjoining land should operate within a higher standard than the minimum state ethics laws and recuse themselves from all discussions on or off the dais)	
US 290/Stearns Lane (Maps 6 and 7)	
These two lots should be retained as Neighborhood Commercial	8
These two lots should be shown as Park, Greenbelt, or Conservation Easement.	6
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creative Development • (prefer NO) But with 100 ft easement between lots and residential. Require developer to buffer and maintain – vegetation screen or other for visual, noise lighting • Just need to be one lot • The City of Sunset Valley should not pay commercial prices, if the City buys these lots. • If the city could purchase parts of these parcels to increase greenspace buffers for the protected gains area and the first few residential properties that would be great. Right now, the best noise/light buffer for the houses on stearns actually would be multi-story office or neighborhood up against the highway with provisions to limit windows looking down on homesteads (clear story style only?) And offset environmental impact with more intensified vegetation planting like those negotiated behind kohls as one example. 	
US 290 west of Holiday Inn (Maps 8 and 9)	
These four lots should be retained as Highway Commercial.	8
These four lots should be changed to Neighborhood Commercial and Neighborhood Office	7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Originally it was thought that all the parcels along the highway would naturally join to create one or two lots that would support bigger projects. Since that has not been the case the remaining bits and pieces would probally work best with a lower classification which by our codes would be nc and nc. This would encourage diversity in businesses as well. 	
6107 Brodie (Map 10)	
This lot should be retained as Single Family Residential	9
This lot should be shown as Park, Greenbelt, or Conservation Easement.	6
Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change zoning when family moves out 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City should not purchase additional property. There is already too much public land. • (Owner Response) Part of this may be used as Residential or Commercial (preferred SF) • I spoke with the Behrens on 6/10/10. Neither want the lot rezoned to greenbelt – YET. Hopefully when they are ready to leave, they will approach the City. In the interim, I suggest SSV acquire right of first refusal • If someone owns it or lives there, it seems it should not be designated as a greenbelt until the City buys it • Change the entire strip on south Brodie to Neighborhood Commercial- traffic is just going to continue increasing • This property is in a waterzone and should most properly be planned for conservation, however with the current use as residential it potentially could be planned as both with preserving a homesite and providing a conservation overlay 	
6203 and 6205 Brodie (Map 11)	
These lots should be retained as Single Family Residential.	6
These lots should be shown as Neighborhood Office	8
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Owner Response) We have commercial all around use and the traffic to go with it, green space behind. It only makes sense to change to NO. My 2 ½ acre lot went up \$60,000 this year. (preferred NO) • While I favor neighborhood office on these tracts (if neighbors are willing). I prefer that the City revisit codes and make no more residential friendly if abutting residential lots, i.e. lighting, architectural style, 2 story limit, type of office, parking, etc. so will fit in then rezone them as NO. • Should be considered Neighborhood Commercial so we could have drive through bank or such- Why did you leave 737 off – that property has more lights, noise and traffic impact than these two properties. All should be rezoned. • Additional commercial development here additional traffic and noise would negatively impact specifically the Oakdale and meadows neighborhoods. In the context of the hundreds of hours citizens put into planning the eventual buildout of our city there were many promises made to preserve the balance of our community especially along Brodie lane. The term “commercial creep” was coined in referencing the commercialization along Brodie lane. The village shopping center was planned with a heavy greenspace buffer on all sides plus the creekbelt buffer bisecting Brodie to punctuate the southern end of our commercial district. Twice before landowners on Brodie have attempted to add more commercial re-zones south of this area and twice before citizens have come out in droves to remind the elected officials to protect them from “commercial creep” here. The city has income streams with designated sales tax to compensate landowners for acquisition of these lands if they so desire to sell. • 	
North end of Stearns Lane (Map 12)	
The city should encourage annexation of this area.	6
The city should not encourage annexation of this area.	7

<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Prefer no annexation) Unless there is a good reason and all the homeowners want it. 	
<p>Apartments on Brodie Lane (Map 13)</p>	
<p>The city should encourage annexation of this area.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>The city should not encourage annexation of this area.</p>	<p>11</p>
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do not need apartments 	
<p>Country White Lane(Map 14-16)</p>	
<p>The city should encourage annexation of this area.</p>	<p>8</p>
<p>The city should not encourage annexation of this area.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>No Comments</p>	
<p>Other comments regarding annexation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annexation to protect current residents and City is a good thing. Please don't shy away from providing City services. Better for the environment in long run, protect both creeks from future development (Country White likely to become apartments), protect Brodie from increased traffic. You (the City) paid commercial appraised value for the Gault property- as you know it is the proper "highest and best use" of surrounding properties We should help bring in all the single family residentials as soon as possible. As to the apartments... because it is multi family special planning would be needed but we should not be afraid of adding this diversity of housing here. In the past the owners of the property expressed interest in coming into the city and even sharing fire protection cost with a pre-annexation agreement. The infrastructure for services are all in place and there is a potential to restructure our water re-sale rates to multi-family to recoup funds as offsets to services. 	
<p>Other general comments on the Future Land Use map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issues on some appear clear and free from doubt. Some are more difficult, such as the Stearns property description. I would take the position that the City ought to make park land for that property that cannot be built on properly. I question the long term value of annexing the Brodie properties. City should not spend money purchasing additional property. Use existing properties held by the City for greenbelt or necessary city services. The South Hills area was – in the past- to be a preserve. We had to be Conservation Rangers to go on tract. What 	

happened? Is it still a preserve? If yes, then follow preserve rules. That could stop a lot of traffic that comes from William Cannon- and would give wildlife the protection we don't give now.

- Thanks Clay- this is nice and thorough. Though you did not include a return address for these comments.
- Should not make so much green space on edge of city as we need another hotel- as our shopping centers age, we need additional sales tax and HOT funds for City services.
- There will always be people who want more development for short term gains. To exist independantly and sustainably as human beings as well as communities requires creative conviction. The leadership challenge is to look at the future with passion and practicality to continue to protect our uniqueness.