

GREENVILLE CENTER QUESTIONNAIRE

And comment sheet

Results and comments from Questionnaires

1. Preference for height of residential structure at Greenville Center

150' building in Stoltz plan

First Choice **0**

Second Choice **0**

Third Choice **7**

Never **1**

Two residential buildings no greater than 85' (1 7-story + 1 4-story), compromise

First choice **0**

Second choice **8**

Third choice **0**

One residential bldg about 60' (4-story from front) in CRG plan

First choice **77**

Second choice **0**

Third choice **0**

[Note: Many people only checked their first choice – or we recorded only 1st choice]

(If they checked them all they were 3-2-1 (except one person was 2-3-1)

Stated reasons: "lower height is more inkeeping with neighborhood"

"35 years later the Rollins Building is still our of place, even on a highly commercial road"

"Taller buildings are undesirable & unsightly & don't fit well with surrounding property"

"I want to keep the esthetic look of the neighborhood. Everyone has paid a significant amount of money for our homes & their neighborhood that th value needs to be preserved – hence the Neighborhood also"

"Stoltz filed plan is unattractive, out of keeping in both style and size with other buildings in community, will create excessive traffic and complicate traffic patterns. Stoltz compromise plan is less an eye-sore than avoce, but with 2 buildings will still create excess traffic and potentially more traffic problems. CRG discussion alternative is more reasonable growth alternative with least aesthetic & traffic problems."

"1st choice would sort of maintain the character of Greenville; last choice would be invasive to the Greenville community"

"Blending with neighborhood"

"The lower the better"

"Consistency with existing character of area"

"Keep high rises out of Greenville to keep light pollution down"

"The higher buildings will loom over adjacent residential areas – and are inappropriate in this area of the Brandywine Valley"

"Tall buildings belong in cities not residential/suburban areas. The DuPont Hotel is 13 stories high. Center City is a fine place for it. Greenville or any other pedestrian oriented mixed use community (Kentlands, MD, New Town, MO, Celebration, FL) would not be. A tall building does not enhance a scenic roadway"

"Higher buildings will destroy the village appearance of Greenville"

"...we don't need an eyesore a la the Rollins Building on Concord Pike"

[nothing marked] "NOTHING more than 2 stories like they already have!!"

"Refer to the introduction of the UDC that speaks of maintaining the character of the area and protects quality of life"

2. Statements that most accurately reflect your feelings about 130' building

0 Could support the 12 story residential building provided it is well designed and overall site includes additional street and internal landscape buffers.

56 I cannot support the 12 story residential building. It is simply too high for the neighborhood and will have serious impacts on the residential character of the community and associated property values.

11 I could support two residential buildings, one or both which could be as much as 25' higher than the existing office building at Greenville Crossing II, provided it is well designed, attractively landscaped and additional landscape buffers are installed along the Kennett Pike.

39 I cannot support any residential buildings greater in height than the adjacent office building at Greenville Crossing II. Any building above that height is simply too high, regardless of design and buffering.

66 I support the CRG Discussion Plan that shows the residential tower at approximately the same height as the adjacent Greenville Crossing II office building.

[Note: many people checked 3 answers]

Comments: *"OR I support buying the land from Stoltz....."*

3. The Stoltz filed plan shows a new 2500 sq. ft. building at the corner of Buck Road and Kennett Pike. The Stoltz compromise plan shows a new 8500 sq. ft. building in this same location. There is speculation that the post office could be moved to this location, regardless of which building is actually constructed. Which statement most closely captures your opinion on this issue

0 I can support the 8500 sq. ft. building if attractive, well buffered with landscaping, and does not include service bays for a PO or other retail use.

21 I can support the 2500 sq. ft. building provided it is attractive, well buffered with landscaping and does not include service bays for a PO or other retail use.

61 No new buildings should be constructed on the corner of this property. I would prefer to see additional retail/office space included in buildings set back from the roads.

4. Would you support the two 6-story buildings if in return it meant no new retail stores fronting Kennett Pike?

13 Yes

53 No

Comments: *"No. While I know we are trying to manage growth, the current configuration of Greenville Center does not allow for "pedestrian Friendly" development. During any week day the available parking is in full use. The only available parking is in the lower rear lot that then requires the pedestrian to traverse pedestrian unfriendly roadways."*

"There should be no new buildings along Kennett Pike"

"Yes, but only if 5 stories or less"

"The design now is a traffic accident waiting to happen!"

"2 six story buildings is too highg – the traffic, particularly along Buck Road, and the flow within the parking areas is already a disaster – the design doesn't seem to improve those problems – it will only be worse"

"A tough call – not really a lot to decide if these are the only options"

"Too much retail exists now and is empty – who is coming to this Center?"

5. Would you support Stoltz's plans if it would deed restrict against future expansion?

13 Yes

48 No

Comments: *"The only reason that Stoltz's plan is allowed is because of deals he struck with former County administrators who profited. His plan only benefits him and his financial partners. He has no interest in the Greenville community except for how much he can financially gain"*

"yes if Stoltz will compromise on his present plans"

"No reassurances that NCC gov't will put future protections in place".

[Person checked NO]: the plan MUST restrict Stoltz!!!

"I am not sure what this means, and would the deed restriction be binding"

Deed restrictions haven't always been honored, and I am told by vote of County Council some are able to be overturned"

"There should be deed restrictions anyhow"

"No – a poor solution now does not help us later"

"Don't trust them, they are in bed with too many people/powers/politicians who could 'change' deed restrictions"

TRAFFIC RELATED QUESTIONS:

6. Do you frequent the Greenville Center?

75 Yes

2 No

If YES, do you find vehicular traffic hazardous?

70 Yes

7 No

Do you find pedestrian walkways adequate and safe?

16 Yes

50 No

Comments: *"YES, especially since Elizabeths opened and Janssens moved"*

7. Do you believe the addition of a 12 story, two 6-story or a 4-story mixed use building will significantly increase traffic flow in the Center?

71 Yes

3 No

"New structures would bring more vehicles. I think it is impossible for ANY new structures not to increase traffic flow. The traffic patterns in the existing center are confusing, poorly designed, hazardous, inefficient, and frustrating"

"Of course, dumb question"

8. To alleviate traffic flow, do you support vehicle and pedestrian connection between GC and Greenville Crossing II?

63 Yes

12 No

Comments: *"Berms only mean that something is being hidden"*

"Greenville Crossing II would become dangerous if this occurred – it would just extend the problems to another area"

"Practically it makes sense and takes cars accessing retail, offices & the post office off Rte 52"

"The Buck Road entrance does not support the existing traffic – can congestion get a grade lower than an 'F'?"

"It wouldn't make that much difference"

9. Do you favor installing berms along Rte 52 and Buck Road?

42 Yes

17 No

"Probably the use of berms would effectively reduce noise and hide cars, BUT the ground area in that corner is limited. Where will the additional cars go if berms take up space?"

"We'd like to see a presentation of this design"

"Think 'right of eminent domain' would be necessary"

"A professional tells me berms give more visual than acoustic protection"

"Very unattractive alternative, but I would be in favor if buildings constructed had loading docks facing those roads"

"Trees are better than berms"

"Berms are eyesores"

10. Are you in favor of installing berms and/or noise barriers behind GC and Greenville Manor?

51 Yes

15 No

Comments: *"This degrades the environment that we Greenville Manor residents like"*
"Noise barriers are unsightly and out of keeping with the community look"
"No, UGLY" "The walls behind RMcD are institutional looking, i.e. UGLY"
"Unsure until I see the design" "Need more info, not sure what this would look like"
"Yes, if the people who live there would like it"

11. Should truck traffic (deliveries and trash hauling) in GC be limited to normal business hours?

54 Yes

11 No

Comments: *"I like the concept of limiting big trucks to business hours, but how could they enter, exit and do their business when the Center is typically most congested with cars? Most times of the day the Center is already overcrowded with vehicles jostling for position, trying to avoid other vehicles & pedestrians enter, exit. I find driving there in mid-day to be frustrating and anxiety producing. A driver must be vigilant and try to move swiftly but cannot safely watch everything at once because there are many cars whos positions change rapidly when drivers sieze an opportunity to move."*
"Limit truck deliveries to non-peak business hours"
"Study 'best' hours for this traffic and limit to those"
"YES if you merely want to ruin the ambience of the community during the day; NO if you also want to disturb people 24/7"
"Before and after normal business hours would help alleviate traffic congestion."
"If there were another entrance for trucks it would be safer – we definitely don't want truck traffic at all hours"
"Why should the residents surrounding this area by bombarded with the noise and intrusion at all hours"

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

"The County Code needs to be changed ASAP – what does County Council do if not protect our land?"

The Brandywine Valley is a unique, special and historic place. Museums and a scenic byway are located here. The area is a tourist destination which should be protected and enhanced"

"What leverage do we actually have at this point??"

"I wish NO were an option!"

"Thank you all of the dedicated people who are leading this constructive effort to develop our community in a manner consistent with its current character!!"

"Both of these projects need to be seen together – separately they are not appropriate for this area – together they are a disaster"

"I don't want the projects at all, but something will be done, so I want what CRG wants"

"Perhaps this may be a 'by right' fiasco, however what about the rights of the residents whose quality of life would be seriously impacted by the mindless intrusion from this growth project. Just the need for additional security lights to these commercial buildings would diminish quality of life. There simply isn't the demand needed for this kind of project to succeed. If you need an idea of what can happen here – go check out the Merchandise Mart on Gov Printz Blvd. What guarantee is there that the necessary funding will be available to complete all the promised improvements?"

Unlike CRG, given an option I am completely against any increase or growth of any kind in this historical and (for now) beautiful area. That said, the By Right idea needs to be realistically addressed and the CRG is as close to an acceptable alternative[as possible]. Ideally I'd like Stoltz to completely drop this project"

"This is like North New Jersey! The outfall of this dense development will be a significant increase in property taxes!"

"Ingress and egress are already hazardous, and there have been a number of cyclists hit by cars"