How do you plan to revitalize downtown Independence when every thing affecting downtown is already under development.

If you were so worried about downtown why would you not have built your new city building there.

I am against the conservation development.
Living in the 'donut' center section of McCullum, we are concerned with the added traffic proposed by the changes to the "Courthouse" area and the Gateway Mixed-use zone area.

Also, the maintenance and cost of maintenance for the 50% green space in the surrounding areas is only roughly outlined with very nebulous plans.

The ability to assign 50% green space is presumptuous.

The rezoning does not provide likable provisions for those living in this area.
Hell No

to Conservation Subdivisions
I do not want the Conservation Subdivision in Independence.
I do not want the "Conservation Subdivision" in Independence.
I do not want this conservation subdivision in Independence, KY.

I do not want the conservation subdivision in Independence.
Please include 109 McAllister in the mixed use commercial.

1. This is the dumbest idea I have ever heard and I am 100% against it.
2. I do not think a developer and his attorney should have been on the committee.
3. I will never be convinced that there is not an alternative reason behind this idea. Someone down the road will be going to reap monetary rewards for this.
4. I do not think it is constitutional to tear someones land.
Interesting study & liked the plans.

I think this is very bad for Independence. It stinks.
I feel there is plenty of traffic flow through the DI zone to fuel its development without re-zoning the CD-SF zone. The "green space" that is currently there is more "green space" than the 50% the CD-SF mandates. Not being in a subdivision or looking right at one is why we chose to move onto McCullum. I feel as if we are not given many options in this situation.

Also traffic implications on McCullum from the mixed use developments at McCullum/17.

I am strongly against building an inculum lot.
This is not Marin County California.
This is the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

This is the no longer elected City Council attacking the private property rights of their neighbors.

I am totally against this.
It goes against the town study.
I think this is criminal.
We object to the Open Space Preservation of 50%. If you sell 100 acres, 50 acres must stay green. And that does not include the yards. Who would buy the land for development? We are against this proposal.

Conservation Area should be optional depending on market conditions.

7.5 acre minimum for mixed use development is too large. There is only 1 land owner in the Mixed Use area that meets this. Again, market conditions should decide. 5 acres is probably a good starting point.

The design of the building should be uniform but not dictated in Mixed use.

If Conservation Subdivision should allow multi-floor buildings if market conditions desire.

Let's finish this. It has been going on far too long.
I am not in favor of conservation sub-division

I am not in favor of conservation sub-division.
I live on Mill Creek Dr. I am AGAINST ANY & ALL DEVELOPMENT BEHIND MY RESIDENCE!

I live in Hartland Subdivision. I am against any changes to the zoning. I do not agree with the Conservation Development Single Family Zone.
WE ALREADY HAVE GREATER DIFFICULTY BACKING OUT OF OUR DRIVEWAYS. IF WE BUILD UP THE DOWNTOWN I QUESTION WHETHER WE WILL BE ABLE TO BACK OUT AT ALL. WILL THE SPEED LIMITS REMAIN THE SAME ON MCCULLUM. WILL WE LOOSE YARD TO SIDEWALKS LATTER?

SEEMS LIKE YOU ARE CHANGING OUR RURAL ROAD INTO AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT. WE HAVE Fought CHANGE IN THE PAST; I'M PLEASED WITH RURAL!

FORGET IT NO
This should be optional to property owners, not some committee making it mandatory to do what they want you to do with your land.

I am totally against the proposed rezoning and development. As a homeowner in Hartland Addison on Millerbank Circle, I do not want an addition in my backyard. It is unconstitutional to rezone this area without a vote by land and property owners. It’s just another policy of our city government.
This should be optional to the property owners, not some committee making it mandatory.
This is criminal and unconstitutional. Leave the existing zoning alone!!!

- This design is specious. This may not be what the market wants. The market will decide unless the government is used to support.
- Not everybody wants to walk!
- The common spaces add costs. Who pays?
- Who is mayor? How do comments get to elected officials?
- What is success ratio of NLRPC small area studies?
- This meeting was planned chaos.
In our opinion, the spring should remain as is for McCulloch Pike. If a developer wants to approach the landowner with a purchase offer, then it should be optional, not that the developer wants the Conservation or Traditional Zoning for that area. We should not be locked into a plan for our land. There seems to be a hidden agenda here.
I think there needs to be a new survey done with the people that actually live up against the area being talked about. Neither we or anyone of my neighbors were ever sent or given a survey to complete about what we wanted for downtown independence.

We may be in favor of what is being planned but it feels like it is being "sneaked" in. If more specifics of what would be done on the boundaries would be given that would be nice.

Enforce property owners to keep up maintenance on their structures & surrounding land. There are existing ordinances regarding this enforcement, right?

Conservation is a great idea, but it should not be required (or limited) of any (all?) voting, property owners.
The conservation area should be optional not mandated.

Residential developers do not want to purchase land that would be restricted to 50% green space. Property owners should not have to search out a developer to purchase their property. This restriction will lower property value.

It seems quite unconstitutional to re-zone land already owned.

Being on the end of Hartland Bivd, with 17 as our backyard, our property value has already taken a hit. This will lower it even more. We already cannot have a conversation on the back deck.

Develop the commercial lots already vacant. This is a rural area by choice. That is why we moved from Ohio to here. The reason businesses are not interested is because the land around Kingss & further South near the library is vacant.

There is also vacant land on Turkeyfoot near UDF & Remke. As well as on Mt Zion Road.

This is not something that the people want in our backyard.
Gateway Mixed Use

1) Limiting the types of commercial & retail activities can hurt the city and stop growth.

2) Limiting the amount of drive through lanes may be prohibitive for business owners. Businesses study the amount of lanes they need and strike a balance between cost of constructing lanes and customer needs. They already design accordingly. Doing otherwise can cause businesses to locate to other areas to avoid this mandate.

3) Gateway features can be expensive and prohibitive and as a result curb growth & businesses locating to the area. Water features, clock towers and things like this should ONLY be an option and not mandatory.

4) This needs MUCH more flexibility.

Conservation Development Zone

1) Some of the purposes are a social outcome and not a land use purpose. Cut out social engineering.

2) SoD to total developments declared as 'conservation' is in effect a mandate for property to go undeveloped as doing so is a losing issue for the land owner. This equates to taking of development rights.

3) Any HOA tasked with maintaining SoD open space is doomed for insolvency and will become a drain upon the city.

4) Conservation Development should never be a mandate. As an option developers & the city can work out a reasonable outcome for all. As a mandate it becomes a taking of development rights.

5) This needs MUCH more flexibility.
1. Required entry fees can be very costly and preventative for business owners.
2. You should not limit the types of businesses. This puts pressure on the ability for the city to grow.
3. Design details add costs and slow growth in the city as business owners will choose to locate elsewhere.
4. Maintenance of character standards are expensive to commercial owners and can cause them to locate elsewhere.
5. Drive through facilities are necessary to encourage many types of commercial activity. Doing away with these can impact current and future business activity.
6. This needs much more flexability.

I AM AGAINST THIS PERPOSAL. I DO NOT WANT PASS THIS ON TO MY FAMILY. I AM EIGHTY ONE YEARS OLD.
I'm against any development that abuts or affects Harland subdivision. The value of our home will go down considerably. The potential builder of row houses (town houses) and patio homes. Any increase in access through Harland would lower property values for the owners of Harland subdivision.

I'm totally opposed to the Conservation district being proposed for the land on McCullum Pl. This is an area of single family homes with nice size lots - not for townhouse style development. One of the members of the Committee (Independence 20 members) said there will be a need for smaller homes for newer citizens. Do they really want to deal with stairs as the pictures depict?

I especially oppose the proposed connection of the Conservancy with Chateau in Harland Park. We don't need more traffic on Harland. Also, we want to maintain our property value.
I am totally opposed to rezoning and redevelopment. This would cause too much traffic through the current subdivision.

This is total disregard to home owners and land owners.

Gateway Area McCallum/KT 17 intersection

Development size minimum size 5+ acres - may - 3.5" assumed North and South sides!

Conservation Subdivision should be optional with multi family being considered around the gateway, mixed use area in the Conservation Subdivision/Single family area.
No mandatory greenspace.

No experimenting w people properties w these ideas.

You blew it when you did not encourage the properties to share ideas w you. 

No one in KY has 50% mandatory conservation. Not Louisville. It is optional.

Unlike Arlinghaus Bldgs, getting to have their four parcels represented by their attorney, Bob Schroder, appointed on this Update Committee, there were no one representing the property owners that are being forced into leaving 50% greenspace appointed to the Update Com. That is not fair. We should have had someone representing us on that Committee.
(1) My father had an old saying—*if it ain't broke, don't fix it***. The downtown doesn't need more government restrictions.

(2) I'm totally against the 50% mandatory green space. I think it is unconstitutional to only have a few property owners have the restrictions put on their properties!!!

(3) We don't need more traditional commercial property—even if it is going to be nice! (What a laugh). Have Arlen's farm support their own commercial venture by abiding by the Small Area Study. That clearly shows good neighborly behavior over...
in color that the gateway zone was to be Mixed Use in front + High Density Residential in back! You mission was to implement Not ReWrite the Study!

Everything you have proposed stinks to High Heaven regarding both the CSF + Gateway Zones.