Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Jewish Community Center's proposal for use of the Amberley Green property. I have been an Amberley Village resident since 1998. I attended one of the open house sessions and was impressed both by the specificity and presentation of materials related to the proposal as well as the effort demonstrated by the Village in holding these sessions to provide information to residents concerning Amberley Green development history, plans and options. Unfortunately, I cannot support the current JCC proposal. 1. I walk at Amberley Green twice daily and have come to value the open space and unrestricted access to the property. While I realize that the JCC proposal professes intent to maintain access to the areas of Amberley Green not included in "its" parcel, it would appear that the JCC will have the ability to restrict that access according to its own schedule and there are no apparent guarantees in terms of non-JCC member/resident access. The lack of any assured alternate access/parking areas effectively means that the JCC, a private non-profit entity, will control access to property owned by Amberley Village and supported by the property taxes paid by residents. This is unacceptable. 2.The current JCC proposal is not a good financial deal for the Village or its residents (read: taxpayers). I am mystified as to why the Village considering essentially giving away the most desirable and accessible part of the Amberley Green property to a well financed/supported private entity, one that as a non-profit will generate no revenue for the Village either in terms of rent or a lump sum purchase payment, nor tax revenue in the form of the income/net profit tax that a for-profit entity would be required to pay. The possible additional revenue in the form of payroll withholding taxes for a handful of possible additional JCC seasonal hires is negligible at best and doesn't begin to justify the $1/year lease arrangement that the JCC is proposing. Meanwhile, we as residents are being taxed at one of the highest property tax rates in Hamilton County as a result of the 10 mil levy we so willingly supported in 2012 and again in 2017. Why should residents continue to shoulder this tax burden while the JCC enjoys free access to some of the most desirable property in the Village? I realize that in purchasing the former Crest Hills golf course property, it was never Amberley Village's intention to maintain the entire property ad infinitum as a park, but rather to provide breathing room to consider alternative uses for the property other than another high-end housing development. I continue to support what I understand was and is the Village's intent to pursue responsible development of the property that would both provide needed public green space as well as perhaps meet additional identified needs the community. This might include AV residents who are aging and wish to remain Village residents but can no longer take care of their single family homes on 1+ acres of property. I support some sort of senior cluster housing development at Amberley Green, perhaps in an interior location of the property, along with a modest allocation of land to a for-profit entity such as a medical office building or other small commercial development that would generate some needed tax revenue for the Village, again with the proviso that any such development carry with it a guarantee of access to remaining undeveloped areas for residents and others to walk. It is theoretically possible that such additional development could take place in addition to some sort of revised JCC proposal, but I would argue that the plan as currently construed does nothing to encourage any additional revenue-generating development and in fact actively discourages it. The JCC proposal 1) eliminates the availability of the most desirable and accessible portion of the property and 2) puts the responsibility for providing vehicle access to any more centrally located areas of Amberley Green on either the Village or a potential future developer, a potentially cost-prohibitive scenario and almost certain impediment to any other development opportunity.	**1**		1			1	1	1		

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
Let us start by saying that we love living in the village. We personally think it is the best kept secret in Greater Cincinnati. Furthermore, we have a beloved dog, Jax, and visit the Amberley Green on a daily basis when we are in town. Currently, there is a community of people at the Green. A wonderful community of dog lovers who value the natural beauty this space provides. Having said that, we understand that the percentage of village residents that currently enjoy these benefits is relatively small. Which brings us to where we are currently...what should the future hold? Our first thought would be that it appears that the Green is one of the largest, if not largest, asset of the village, after having reviewed the ownership records of the Hamilton County Auditor. We have also reviewed the JCC proposal of use for the property and will make our comments below. As one of the largest village assets, why would the village give the property to the JCC for nothing? What are the village residents really getting in return? This makes no sense to us. If it is a financial issue, then sell the property to the JCC, but why would the most desirable parcel of the property be given to the JCC for nothing? The list of amenities the JCC would build includes two pools, day camp facilities, amphitheater, playing fields, playground space and walking paths. The FAQ state that these amenities would be available to residents at “various times”. What does this mean? They would be available during non-summer months? Maybe weekends? Currently the JCC has a pool available to members. Why not make this pool more readily available to the residents? The JCC also currently has a day camp and the Green has walking paths. It appears the only thing we are gaining is the use of playing fields and an amphitheater at “various times”. Big deal. We are willing to give our largest asset for that? That does not appear to be in the best interest of the Village. Rebecca is a CPA and would like to know what the Village gains financially? The increase in payroll taxes for a couple of camp counselors? That would not cover the increase in Village services required of the project. If however, the village wants to partner with JCC, has the Village considered funding the project and then leasing the space back to the JCC, thus providing an income stream in the future. The project could be funded with bonds or possibly a levy (not sure how that works). The income stream from a long term lease should offset the debt secured and cover the added costs to be incurred for services by the Village. If the Village does not consider this a feasible plan, then why not make the lease payment from the JCC at market value to enable to Village to provide required services and come out of the deal ahead of game financially. Why shouldn’t the Village be a winner in this project as well? Next, let’s address the unused parcels in the JCC plan. I would love to see this parcel be fenced and kept as a green space as it currently exists. Not a lot of maintenance, just natural to enjoy the beauty of nature with our fur babies. If the issue of maintenance is an issue, has the Village considered establishing an endowment or a fund to offset the costs? We are certain that we are not the only residents who love the space the way it is and would be willing to contribute to something of this nature. It is such a gift to have this in our community. However, the JCC proposal carves out area for “future development”. Our question, is development by whom? The Village or the JCC? I would hope it would be the Village has the decision to decide how the undeveloped parcels could be used. Admittedly, being selfish, we would like it to remain a green space for walking, but the Village should be able to decide if it remains a green space or developed commercially in the future. Commercial development could provide an additional income stream to the Village. Our final thoughts. Why would the Village enter into an agreement that would give away a valuable asset with minimal return? We’ve not even addressed the issue of property maintenance. It’s our understanding that the Village would still be required to maintain the property. Again, that doesn’t make sense. We are giving away the asset but would still be required to maintain it? As residents, are our taxes being reduced by this proposal? That’s not our understanding. This proposal does not seem to be in the best interest of the Village or its residents. Thank you for hearing our thoughts.	**2**	1	1			1	1			

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
Kerry and I live in Amberley Village and we are JCC members, so we have an interest on both sides. As with any joint endeavor, both parties need to benefit. In going to the meeting and reading the information, it seems that the JCC gets benefits, but we don't see much benefit for the Village if the JCC takes the prime area as the plan stands. We are in favor of developing the property but only if it benefits Amberley Village and its ambiance. Amenities: Amberley Village already has a playground, a playing field, and walking paths. If the pools are not available to all Amberley families during prime time and prime season because of the camp, then there is not much benefit Also, there are already pools at the JCC for members. I understand that the JCC wants to use some pool areas for other things, but there is always more than one way to do something. Demolition of the Old Clubhouse: It would be great if the JCC agrees to demolish the old clubhouse. Leasing for $1 Per Year: Leasing the property for $1 benefits the JCC, but if the Village has to pay for fire and police and upkeep, then that adds more financial strain to the Village. Dog Park: Walking the Amberley Green with our dog is a favorite daily activity. If the walking paths are taken away in favor of a dog park, here are some consequences: The casual, inclusive community of Village dog walkers would not be as strong. Almost any time of day, you can meet a neighbor. Sometimes it's someone you know and others it's someone you just met and walk and get to know each other. People and dogs alike get cardiovascular exercise in a beautiful, safe, and calming park. The majority of dog walkers are respectful of others and their dogs. If your dog is having a bad day, there is enough space to walk and keep your dog away from others. People pick up after their pets. In the early morning, the bullfrogs are the most vocal. It is a beautiful symphony to walk by the pond and watch the fish and hear the bullfrogs, crickets, and birds. If the JCC takes over the pond, the best part of an early morning walk would disappear. Resorting to a dog park, means dogs and people are in a confined area, possibly without shade. People and their dogs do not get cardiovascular activity. Dogs are more likely to not be as well behaved. From the dog parks I've been to, many people do not pick up their dog poops. Adding More Entrances and Exits: Currently we feel relatively safe walking alone, walking with people we just met, or walking with other neighbors. Too many entrances and exits makes it easier for crime. Most small park areas, or areas where children may be playing have only one or two entrances and exits. Ideas to Explore: Set up an endowment for the upkeep of Amberley Green. This has been successful in other places. We would definitely support an endowment. Sell bonds with the proceeds benefitting Amberley Green. *Make sure whatever development happens benefits the majority of the residents in Amberley Village, monetarily, keeping the country type atmosphere, and adding benefit to living here.	**3**	1	1		1		1	1		
Questions regarding the JCC Plan that I did not see answered in all the information provided: What is the minimum development dollars that JCC has pledged to their plan? Estimated membership fees for residents?? There must be a pro forma number in their feasibility study. Have other "Health Club" Developers been solicited? What is the term of the $1 lease? I apologize if these answers are already available.	**4**	1	1			1			1	

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
My concerns: * Prime locations being used for a 10 week Day Camp, rather than having potential housing developers have input about future placement of condos, homes, etc. • If this is truly just for the Day Campers, then the baseball field is extravagant usage of prime development space. Cincinnati Knothole League games are played in the EVENINGS at 6:30 pm. Who is responsible for mowing the outfield & dragging the in-field before each game? • What financial amount do "Developers" think the amount of added value these "Day Camp" facilities will create for Amberley Green? • Are these projected facilities just for the "Day Camp", or will ALL members be using the new swimming pool? If so, then this development site (A.G.) will be busy till 8:30pm throughout the summer. If so, would a developer/future home owners find this appealing? • Why build new tennis courts? (I feel this will use prime development space when courts already exist.) • Why another baseball field in Amberley Village, we already have two. • Is the JCC is planning to expand their facility by using Amberley Green for just $1/year under the pretense of the "Day Camp" ?? I think we need more clarification on this. Stating that these "amenities" will add value to Amberley Green is a guess, until we see/have numbers on paper from future potential developers. I truly fear that Council is going to cave under pressure from the JCC to expand their facility for $1/year without doing their homework.	**5**	1			1	1	1		1	
This is my second response letter due to information that appears to have been available at the open house. In the Open House FAQs: •Why was it not noted in the FAQs that the JCC proposal has been unanimously approved by the Land Committee? •Why did you not include in the FAQs that the Village will pay $50,000 annually toward the maintenance of the JCC pool? • There seems to be no economic benefits to be had. oDoes not maximize economic benefit to the Village oDoes not minimize Village financial contribution •It would appear the Village wants to gift this land to the JCC. Why? This makes no sense to lease for $1:00 per year and pay for pool maintenance. On top of that there is a huge lists of costs the village will have to cover on street access, infrastructure modifications etc. the list goes on….. All I hear and see are $$$$$$ going out, nothing coming in. Development for the sake of development only means nothing benefits the village and its expenses. For Example: Money issues…… I had a 18" storm water drain line caving in under my drive; had to wait until the next fiscal year to find the funds to fix it. Over a year's wait. Resurfaced the asphalt driveway, and almost a year to the day, lines running out of the street storm water sewer started leaking. No money to repair, asphalt filled in the hole without underground repair. This April,2019, the patch is sinking…….hole is opening up under the recently paved driveway again. I cannot believe we are considering this $1.00 per year lease agreement.	**6**									

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding the Mayerson JCC Proposal for the Amberley Green. We live at 3012 Burning Tree Lane and our property backs up to the Green space, very near to the current Community Garden and former Clubhouse. Given our close proximity to the space, we have a particularly vested interest in how the land is developed. We would like to submit the following thoughts for your consideration: Financials/Economic Impact Given the relatively heavy tax burden that residents of Amberley face, it goes without saying that a lucrative business development of the Green property would certainly help the Village's bottom line. We appreciate the efforts that Council has made to explore commercial development opportunities, and understand the challenges that have so far precluded that. However, a big part of what makes Amberley so special is our sense of community, and we do feel that the JCC's plan would contribute to that in a positive way. We would much rather see the Amberley Green put to good use than to languish. That said, the financial arrangement put forth in the current JCC Proposal seems a bit one-sided, in favor of the JCC. From our understanding the only real revenue this project would generate for the Village is a very modest employment tax that would not even offset the costs of maintaining the land. So we think some work still needs to be done toward making this partnership mutually beneficial financially for both the JCC and the Village of Amberley. In addition, we do think it would be appropriate and much appreciated for the Mayerson JCC to offer a discounted membership to all residents of Amberley Village as part of this deal. How much of a discount is certainly up for debate. Noise/Privacy Concerns Heavy foliage (mostly trees and honeysuckle bushes) currently serves as a natural barrier between our backyard and the Green. Nonetheless, we can hear people speaking in the current Community Garden from our backyard, so noise is a concern for us. We do think additional landscaping is needed to help alleviate the noise associated with the proposed outdoor activities. This would be of particular concern to us if in the future the current Clubhouse area is developed. Privacy is also a big concern for us. We currently struggle with people cutting through our yard without our permission to access the Green space from Burning Tree Lane. This includes not only neighbors, but also strangers. People who are not residents of Amberley have even parked their car on Burning Tree Lane in order to access the Green by walking through our yard, presumably to avoid registering for a vehicle parking pass. We're worried that the proposed development of the Green could make this problem even worse, so we welcome any help and suggestions to deter people from doing this. Water Drainage In the past we have reached out to the Village for help with water run-off from the Green. The land currently slopes from the old Clubhouse pool down toward the rear of our property. During heavy rainfall this creates a river running through our backyard. We believe there were some attempts made to correct this prior to us purchasing our home, but the problem persists. We would appreciate it if this could be taken into account during the demolition and development of the current Clubhouse area. Traffic Concerns We share many of our neighbors' concerns with traffic in the area. Even without further development of the Amberley Green, traffic on Ridge Road is a problem. When exiting our home on Burning Tree Lane, we are confronted with the congestion of Ridge Road pretty much all the time. Currently it feels like a game of Frogger trying to make a left out of our neighborhood onto Ridge Road northbound toward Galbraith. Vehicles routinely travel above the speed limit around the bend heading north on Ridge just past the Municipal Building, making it especially difficult for us to pull out onto Ridge. We welcome the addition of a stoplight at Ridge and Fairhaven and hope this will help slow down the traffic. Dog Park We think a Dog Park is a great idea. We are dog lovers ourselves and have a French Bulldog that we absolutely adore. Unfortunately we very rarely enjoy the Green now because of the current off-leash dog policy. If there is to be a dedicated Dog Park somewhere on the Green, we strongly suggest that it be a large, fenced-in area where dogs can run to their hearts' content without worry of them wandering off where they don't belong. Separate areas for small dogs vs. big dogs would be great. But the remainder of the Green should have a strict leash policy. The current policy allowing dogs to be off-leash if they are under the owner's voice command is a disaster. We constantly have off-leash dogs running into our yard while their owners repeatedly call for them from the Green. It's a nuisance as well as a safety concern. Coyotes In the past year or two we have seen a sharp increase in coyote activity not just on the Amberley Green, but in our neighborhood as well. We routinely have coyote tracks on our driveway and can hear their howling and yelping most nights. We have also come face-to-face with them on several occasions. Evidence of their kills litters the Green. Worst of all, neighborhood pets have been attacked. We fear that the proposed development of the Green could force these coyotes further into our neighborhoods. It is a grave concern. And since much of the proposed development of the Green centers around outdoor children's activities, something most certainly will need to be done to address the growing coyote problem. There could potentially be some very real safety concerns given the current situation. Thank you again for your hard work on this project, and for giving us the opportunity to make our voices heard. We look forward to the next steps and seeing this project come to fruition.	**7**			1	1				1	
Donate the land to Great Parks of Hamilton County and get the benefits of green space, education, and public recreation. Reap the benefits rather than surrender the benefits of PUBLIC lands to a private, monetary focused entity	**8**									

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
After more searching and investigation into activities/documents surrounding the JCC agreement some key facts and information have been omitted from the FAQs presented on the JCC development plan. It seems there is prejudice in favor of the JCC by withholding information which was available prior to the Open Houses. • The Village should have presented as much "known" information available at this time so objective decisions can be made (as there is considerable unknown financial information and negative effects on the Village based on any development). • It seems the JCC is working under a completely different set of requirements than the original (4) developers. Why is this? • No economic benefits to be had. o Does not maximize economic benefit to the Village o Does not minimize Village financial contribution • It would appear the Village wants to gift this land to the JCC. Why? In the Open House FAQs: • Why was it not noted in the FAQs that the JCC proposal has been unanimously approved by the Land Committee? • Why did you not include in the FAQs that the Village will pay $50,000 annually toward the maintenance of the JCC pool? • Councilman Warren attended a December 2018 meeting and commented "The type of revenue that the Village will can expect from this (JCC agreement) is going to be minimal". This was one of the critical objectives. Should have been included as a FAQ. • At one point it was mentioned the JCC has tried to listen to the comments heard from council and the community. (How many residents were contacted for their input? 5, 50, 100?) Why wasn't more "quantifiable" information included in the FAQs about how much input was received and how you received it? • At an open house I was told Village revenue from this project would be ~$30,000 - $35,000. In Land Development Committee meeting minutes in December, 2018, it was noted additional revenue from camp staff and additional jobs would be $15,000 – 20,000. Why such a difference and why not be clear and publish this in the FAQs. (Based on 2% earnings tax = $1,000,000 in salaries for only a 3 month period of time) – this is hard to believe and needs further fact checking. o Any earnings tax received will not compensate the Village for a 27 acre, multi-million dollar land giveaway (which ultimately will hinder any further planned, economic development). Additional Comments: • Why did the Land Development Committee decide not to take a bit more time to seek legal clarity on the Amberley Development Partners proposal after so much time was invested? The City Solicitor had been active in review of many parts of the selection process. Seems a simple task. You had agreed they were the best group to work with moving forward. • Why did the Land Development Committee not meet with DOV Group after failing to move forward on the ADP agreement? Mayor Muething reported that if an agreement with ADP could not move forward, the committee selected DOV Group next. • The JCC sent a letter of interest to the Village one (1) month before making the decision to not move forward with the ADP proposal. Coincidence? • Does the Village have a clear and concise set of goals and objectives for the property? If so, communicate these. I see from the request for proposals: o Maximize economic benefit to the Village o Improve economic health and sustainability for the Village o Minimize Village financial contribution • If the Village has changed the original objectives in the request for proposals, shouldn't you have notified the developers? Would seem to be the right thing to do to keep all parties in the know. Was any attempt made for further clarification of village objectives? • In May of 2016, almost 10 months after requesting development proposals it was noted that the original Long Range Plan is outdated. What were your goals and objectives based upon then? • It has also been noted the Village does not have the skill base within its administration to take a wholistic look and determine the plan for development of Amberley Green. Based upon what you have demonstrated up to this point, there is no question on this. • JCC stated during the initial proposal process they were not interested as the sole party for development but would be interested in partnering with someone on the property. Now they seem to be calling the shots by locking up the best land, at minimal benefit to the Village, minimal cost to them, while making further development more difficult. Both ADP and DOV indicated they would want to work with the JCC and were mentioned to be qualified by the Village as potential developers. • Council sought & signed off on the idea that they would look to the developer to put together an economic proposal, beneficial to the village for the whole property. If Council wanted to advantage/disadvantage the JCC, the developer could show the impact this may have on other pieces of the project to keep the project viable. • Since the Village has demonstrated its inability to balance the annual budget, some type of development will be required to maintain the property. The current JCC plan meets none of the goals and objectives set forth for the property.	**9**	1	1			1	1		1	
The proposal sounds amazing! On another note, I would very much like to see Amberley develop a dog park. Thank you!	**10**				1					

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
We have many questions regarding the JCC acquiring 30 acres of the previous Crest Hills CC. I have been privy to the world of two Jewish Country Clubs, the tenuous joining into one, developers not be allowed to build on the property and so much more. Amberley paid an adsorbent fee to acquire the property then proceeded to budget for the high price of maintenance of the property. I can only guess what the remediation cost was for a 60's building. Basically, Amberley has continued to bleed for this property. I am now trying to grasp what logic is behind the JCC agreement. We have been residents since June 2015. The questions are: 1. Is Mercy paying for their property? If so, why not JCC? If not, why not? 2. What benefits do the property owners receive for allowing the JCC to lease land for 99 years at $1? Amberley's current income comes from our property and Personal income taxes. It is not good business practice to say that a for-profit entity gets a break and that the property owners rates go up. I, like many other Jewish families, have left the JCC. We were paying $101/month for a family membership when it first opened. Suddenly, we noticed the amounts they were charging us started climbing. We were given no notice of these increases. Once their charge hit $126 ($1012/year to $1512/year), we decided that we were done. We have not returned to the JCC due to the high cost. Will residents of Amberley receive special rate memberships (Blue Ash Rec Center has an outstanding facility that the residents only pay $200 a year to belong) 3. Will the JCC take over property tax for the property? I know the cities are exempt? 4. Is the JCC going to take over the maintenance of all 133 acres? 5. How will the additional traffic be funneled in and out? Getting in and out of our neighborhood is already hindered by the 8485 facility. I heard talk that there is a back way close to Ronald Regan and Galbraith--Doesn't Reading (and Cincinnati) need to be part of this agreement? 6. What are the financial benefits to Amberly? The info states income tax for JCC employees. But that is negligible. Especially if the employees just move from one location to the other. How much does the village get for the current JCC? Again, what is the finacial benefit of allowing a $1 lease? 7. There were suggestions of a retirement village. Has Amberly been in discussions with any groups? Info on that proposal? 8. Love the idea of the park & Community facility. Where would the funding come from? Whomever Amberly chooses to partner?. If JCC or Retirement community, their income to the Village should cover the building and maintenance of the park. 9. What is the purpose of the property on Longmeadow back to Patrisal? There had been talk of developing that land as well. 10. If there are no perceived benefits to the residents or substantial income investment to the Village why is this even being considered?	**11**	1	1	1		1	1		1	
JCC has a great plan! Keep up the good work with them.	**12**									
As a resident, I think if you are going to lease taxpayer funded land for ~ $1, that entity should offer those residents bearing the brunt of its cost a membership discount because in a way, they would be paying even more than the current cost of membership to the JCC. Otherwise this whole deal is a bit sketchy and definitely unbalanced and unfair for residents.	**13**	1	1				1			
Upon attending one of the open house meetings, speaking with some of the hosts and reviewing the documents, the proposed JCC project seems one-sided, at best. Where else in Hamilton County can you get 30 acres of ground for such a bargain as what is being offered to the JCC? The project has many"proposed" ideas but they are just that, "proposed". What concrete benefits do the Amberley residents receive? They seem few. More likely there will be increasing restrictions placed on those who currently use AG i.e. leashing your dog at all times or having restricted access to the park. The village is offering the best 30 acres for a give away price. Great for the JCC. Not so much for Amberley Village as I see it. I am opposed.	**14**	1	1		1					

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I think there are a lot of questions that still need to be answered. —I do not think having the JCC only paying $1 a year to Amberly for use of the Amberly Green property is not enough. The JCC is taking the prime land from the Amberley Green and whatever land is left to sell or rent to potential customers will not be desirable. I think the JCC should be located in another area of the Amberly Green. —I would like to know how $25,000 was calculated as the total income coming in from the JCC annually. That is not enough income to justify giving them this prime location. We will need more police to patrol this area especially since there will be a camp ,recreational space, amphitheater, swimming pool , tennis courts etc. $25,000 will not be enough to cover the cost of police patrol. —Amberley traffic on Ridge Road is terrible now. That will only get worse during camp hours. Amberly needs to look at other options for a road leading into the Amberley Green. I think it is a better idea to widen Galbraith Road by the turn in the hill into two lanes where you can then enter into Amberley Green. I think the JCC should build this opening and a road leading into Amberley Green. —who will maintain this property in the future (10,20, 50 60 years from now) Amberley council needs to take this into consideration. Amberley should have put a school system in years ago. They did not think about the future of Amberley. One main reason for houses not selling in Amberly is because we do not have our own school system. —Amberley Village council and the Amberley Village administration need to find a better solution for this property. They also need to work with real estate agents not only for the Amberley Green sight but for the housing market. —according to Tom Muething, there are not enough restaurants for a company or other agencies employees to eat at near the Amberly Green. There are lots of restaurants on reading road. There are about 8 restaurants in the dillonvale and deer park area. — Tom also mentioned in the future developing town homes and or villas on the Amberly Green property. Again I feel this is a mistake. —I am not in favor of this plan. I think the JCC can figure other options that will benefit them and Amberley Village. I think there need to be more meetings to figure out a new plan. I think Amberley council and administration need to keep the Amberley residents updated and invited to more planning sessions. Ultimately it is the residents who will be paying more taxes for any unforeseen sights. —I am sure I will think of more reasons that there are better alternatives for the property.	**15**	1	1	1		1	1		1	
I am an Amberley Village resident. I am 41 with a young family. I have spoken to Tom Meuthing on one occasion regarding Amberley Green (he is my brothers-in-law's neighbor). I think I have a good understanding of the issues surrounding the village ownership of the green. Because of work and family commitments I will likely not be able to attend the public forms to discuss The Green. So I am sending this email in my absence. I have seen the plan and was really happy and excited for the amenities proposed. Our family would use much of them such as the sports fields, the pools and the amphitheater. All-in-all it seems like a great plan. Why should we have to drive to summit park when Amberley has such great scenery. There are a few things I would like to mention as you consider their proposal. 1) it would be nice for Amberley residents to have free access to the facilities on The Green if the lease ends up being so generous ($1). For the record I am a JCC member and my children have attended the ECS I would still pay extra for access but other might not. 2) Please consider how a deal with the JCC or another developer would help offset the tax burden of some of the villages younger owners. (Those of us who still file a W9 for income.) 3) traffic is a significant issue especially at 5:00 please think about ways to improve this situation. A popular recreational facility will only increase traffic. Great work finding a relevant, and possibly financially successful way to open The Green up to more than just dog walkers. Keep up the good work. My family and I are excited to see this proposal move forward.	**16**	1	1	1		1	1			

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
Shortly after we built our new home on Legacy Trace in 2006, we became aware of the availability of Amberley Green for walks. This has become part of our daily routine, and without exaggeration, is the most important aspect of our life in Amberley from the standpoint of personal well-being. During the past 13 years, our property taxes paid to Amberley have increase exponentially, I believe more than quadrupling, while the value of our home has gone up by far less than this. We are happy to continue to live in Amberley SUBSTANTIALLY DUE TO OUR BEAUTIFUL AND FULLY ACCESSIBLE Amberley Green. We also visit and enjoy the JCC. We would consider re-locating to a community with a better park system and green spaces if, due to JCC expansion or any other use of the land, AG becomes essentially unavailable to us, and/or becomes much reduced in the size of what is accessible to us for all the activities listed below: We walk our dog. We jog. We marvel at the birdsong all day and the bullfrog calls at dusk. We take photos in different seasons. We walk the paths and we walk on the grass. We watch the trees and wildflower fields evolve each month. We admire the community garden in all its phases through the year. We do these activities solo, together, and with other family and friends. We have made new friends specifically from our time spent in AG, as the large and active community of AG users are friendly, wonderful folks. It is the only aspect of Amberley that truly feels like a community to us. Importantly, we tell our friends and colleagues about this aspect of Amberley! By the way, we are also original and continuing members of the JCC, and use the facilities regularly; our kids have participated in camps in the past, and have even been camp counselors. At this time, we don't see the need or even value of a new outdoor pool, or of tennis courts (available in all communities for little or no charge, including Amberley). If it would be mutually beneficial to pursue some part of AG being leased for camp activities, I would expect JCC to pay a reasonable price for that, and to include that in their operating costs, in their calculation of camp fees, etc. I would oppose any use that would remove more than a small proportion of the green space from complete accessibility to the community (but am confident that a small amount of land would meet the needs of JCC camps). Also, while we originally moved to Amberley thinking daily walks would be done in French Park, this quickly became only an occasional activity. Why? The trails are overgrown, usually muddy, frequently impassable, and completely out of the question for much of the winter months. Nancy (an active 62-year- old woman) has personally fallen and been injured there due to these trail conditions. Walking along the road to avoid trail conditions, has led to nearly being hit by cars on two occasions. French Park in no way compares to the pleasures and beauty of Amberley Green, and never will, due to the Cincinnati Parks' appropriate preservation of this as a forested area. AG is a great asset to our community, is worth every penny we paid for it. Further, the accessible green space of AG is worth every penny of foregone property taxes that would accrue from development. Therefore, we support strongly some modest part of the land being used (at a fair price, not $1/year) by JCC (an institution we have supported ourselves since its inception), especially for camps, but do not currently support swimming and tennis there (this adds no value to the community or to JCC for that matter, campers can easily spend part of the day at the main JCC campus for swimming, and could use the existing under-utilized Amberley tennis courts for tennis). Nor do we support developing the property with residential or commercial development. We enthusiastically support preserving the current use pattern of Amberley Green. Since its value is in its natural beauty, there is no pressing need for any "improvements" such as replacing paths, it is fine as is, so we believe projecting costs for current use patterns should be carefully examined for accuracy. We oppose any significant reduction of the amount of land and/or reduction in the accessibility of this green space to the current and future communities of people who are frequent, often daily, users. This is not only for the benefit of direct users of AG, but for the property values of the entire Amberley Village. As an environmental economist, I have reviewed studies and statistics on the value of green space, and especially green space openly available for recreational use. This is one of the most frequently overlooked factors in planning land usage in a community. I also know that once green space is gone, it is gone forever, and you cannot generally get it back at any price. Let's not understate the value of this accessible green space to our community, and to our property values. Purchasing this land was a wise and far-sighted decision, let's keep our eyes on the long term welfare of Amberley Village!	**17**	1	1			1		1	1	

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I attended three recent open house meetings and gathered and looked through available handouts. I also attended the initial meeting in the Community Room where the JCC made their initial presentation to residents. If I recall, the Land Development Committee (LDC) was seeking resident input, in order for the LDC to make a formal recommendation to Council, whether to move forward in negotiations with JCC. It's been 3+ years since April 18, 2016 when the JCC formally asked the Village "to temporarily delay a decision on development of Amberley Green", that in this joint AG/JCC effort, I was not presented with, among other things: •A summary of any proposed "shared use agreement" •Detailed financial info, ie projected revenue & Village costs •Traffic modification costs •Current bids on aspects of the project (clubhouse teardown & remediation) •Amenities mentioned in the proposal are duplicative to those currently available to residents: oTennis courts oBall fields oMulti-purpose fields oPlaygrounds The JCC proposal envisions two swimming pools, even though there wasn't enough interest in the Amberley Village Swim Club to keep it viable. Both options in the "Visioning Study" positioned everything in the southeast corner of the property. This placement allows access all the way to the rear of the property down a central corridor, which the JCC proposal does not. This southeast corner location seems far less intrusive to the majority of the property. The southeast corner would allow current resident users the ability to keep most of their current access points at AG intact. There are many additional costs we may incur if we move forward under the current proposal, such as, yet to be determined conditions within any shared use agreement. If the JCC project comes to fruition, I feel that current and future Councils may give undue consideration to the JCC of any future requests or modifications to any terms and conditions surrounding the project, and perhaps even broader utilization of the property. The JCC may also have other options such as the 8-9ac across the street from their facility. This property seems to be in JCC friendly hands, is flat, and could support the majority, if not all of what the JCC is seeking to accomplish at AG. According to "Open Village Finances" on our Village website we have a budgeted SHORTFALL averaging ($315,000) in 2018 as well as 2019. To me, It seems financially prudent to wait until additional revenue materializes and reserves are built, before moving forward with this proposal. Something that comes to mind is the 8 mil police levy, which may not continue in its current form, or may expire and not be renewed. This could make our financial situation even more problematic. Several years ago the Village was in much worse financial shape, and I was concerned enough to attend various Council, Village Finance & Budget Committee meetings. Under serious consideration at that time was incurring Municipal debt to pay for the AG property. We had been rolling over the debt and just making interest payments and needed to pay for the property. If we had we not received the "out-of-the-blue" estate tax windfall of $5mm ish, we would have incurred debt to pay for the property. This debt would still be outstanding. If we had debt outstanding on the property, in my mind, any idea of leasing the choice 30 acres in Amberley Green at ONE DOLLAR per year, would be considered preposterous by all. This current proposal falls far short of helping the Village recoup in any meaningful way, our embedded $6,000,000+ investment of tax dollars in the property, therefore I am opposed to The Plan as I currently understand it.	**18**	1	1			1	1			
Our feelings are that they should be allowed to go ahead with their plan for the area camp. This will also allow there to be some options to rent the amphitheater to public and bring in some dollars. Also use of the pool and tennis courts for members at a small fee. We feel this would be a start to further projects in the future once this development is done. We do not agree with the cost or better use to make pathway along Ridge Rd at the cost suggested. Also a danger for folks crossing Ridge Rd. We definitely DO NOT agree with making entrance to the green from the top of Fernwood Drive and others. This will be an inconvenience to the quietness of our road and NOWHERE to park on this already narrow road.	**19**		1	1		1				

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
Overall I I see little positive for AV in many areas- very little income, large capital expenditures, increased traffic and noise, and less natural area. It appears that the AV representatives have achieved their objective in obtaining a JCC development plan but have ignored other possibilities. A residential plan needs to be reconsidered including reducing the minimum lot size with a tax credit limit. Could a tax credit limit (or no credit at all) be imposed on the AG development? Also how about a credit limit applied to the Rollman development? The proposed area takes much of the developable land and blocks access to other development. The development should be essentially rectangular in the southeast corner and south of Fairhaven if extended west. It is imperative that the proposed Fairhaven western extension be kept open since the feasibility of both the proposed Knollcrest and Galbraith entrances are questionable. However there is a flat area on two of the former fairways (approximately west of Fairhaven) that could be easily converted to ball fields. This area could be leased to the JCC on an annual basis and canceled by AV if a development opportunity arises. Capital improvements to this area as ballfields would be minimal considering the nearly flat terrain. A few trees would require removal. Aren't the tennis courts valued at a value in the ballpark of the clubhouse demolition? Is that a fair trade? When does the MND agreement end? The proposed amphitheater will be used only a few times per year. It is likely that this would never be considered if the land wasn't free. In addition outdoor performances would disturb the neighbors. The proposed multi-purpose ball field at the southern border may be disruptive for the neighbors. Instead suggest a ballfield in the former fairways described above. The proposed Knollcrest road access presents problems. Who pays for the land acquisition and demolition for existing houses on Galbraith? The terrain looks very steep and challenging for a road. Also getting out of the proposed road would be difficult considering the curve on Galbraith. Is the proposed road over the dam (the proposed Galbraith entrance) allowable? What about for heavy construction trucks? Who pays for this road assuming the dam allows. Other non-related developments in the NE corner (The Village Commons) are being presented as part of the JCC plan but are not real. Why is this being presented? The income tax from workers employed at AG is uncertain but will not be substantial. How many workers will be taxed and will they be seasonal? In nearly every similar case I'm aware of the tax income is greatly overstated. Suggest some minimum payment and if income tax exceeds the minimum then the tax would be additional. The whole case of an income tax credit limit needs to be addressed. The lack of one (in part) got AV into the Crestview court case and subsequent AG purchase. And remember that AV stands nearly alone in having no tax credit limit. Other "upscale" first suburbs have credit limits including Wyoming, Blue Ash, Montgomery, Madeira, and Mariemont. Meanwhile Indian Hill, Deer Park and Silverton allow no credit at all. The existence of a tax credit limit would encourage professionals to build an office building on the AG site.	**20**	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	
I have been a resident in Amberley Village for only a few months, we just purchased a home here to raise our family. I am very satisfied with the city and am excited for the future plans. We currently are members of the YMCA not the JCC. I hope the Amberley Green space will be open to Village residents who are not a part of the JCC. We are very active people. It is challenging for me to run and ride my bike on the roads of Amberley. Please consider the connector from the municipal building to the green and as much walking/running space as possible. We also have a dog. It would be so wonderful to have a dog park in our "backyard". It saddens me that dogs are not allowed in the municipal walking space by the fire house. I am also a swimmer. The primary reason we belong to the YMCA and not the JCC is the swimming access. I would really hope for a separate lap pool as I think this was a miss by the JCC in the original structure.	**21**		1		1					
Our family heard about the plans for a community development including an outdoor pool or set of 2 pools from a newsletter we received. The outdoor pool plan at the Amberley Green would be HUGE for our family, we are all big swimmers. I compete in US Masters Swimming, my son is joining a swim team this summer in Pleasant Ridge & my husband takes adult swim lessons at the JCC. I have tried to get into other summer community pools like Blue Ash, Wyoming or Montgomery because Amberley does not have its own outdoor pool that is regulation size or offers a swim team option. I would be very interested in promoting a kids' swim team in the summers if this happens eventually! Also I talk to the other lap swimmers at the J as I swim 3 x a week, and definitely a bigger pool would be much welcome, even if it's only in the summers. I have considered going to the Blue Ash Y or Powell Crosley Y to lap swim in the summers.	**22**		1							
A fenced dog park would be a wonderful addition to the property. One for small Dogs and one for large.	**23**				1					

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I have been using the property of Amberley Green to go running each week since my new job restricted my ability to drive further from my home for my weekly runs. I have been an Amberley resident and taxpayer for the last 13 years, and I have to say I am somewhat baffled that any resident would be in favor of the proposed plan. I do not see any sort of financial benefit to the village, since the hiring of additional staff will not be generating significant tax revenue- the JCC will mostly be relocating existing staff from the other campus and whatever additional counselors they hire will be cheap labor from high school and college kids and not exactly filling the village's coffers. Any revenue they did generate would most likely be offset by whatever the village has to invest, as per point 5 of the FAQs, in order to make this property suit the JCC's purposes. So what do we as residents gain from this endeavor exactly? A beautiful and protected green-space will be chopped up and turned over to a day camp that will not serve my children's needs, we will undoubtedly have increased traffic on Ridge Road, and while the village is operating at a deficit, we are looking to acquire additional debt through rehabbing some aspects of the property. I would truly love to be convinced otherwise, but at this point I feel that this plan is one that only helps the JCC and is not of any direct benefit to the taxpayers of Amberely Village and those of us who take advantage of Amberley Green in its current iteration, a treasured haven in our busy and cluttered world. I can be reached by cell phone if Scott or any others can elucidate things further (201) 492-0911	**24**		1	1		1		1		
Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the development of Amberley Green. I provided some hand-written comments at one of the open-house sessions, but I wanted to give a little more detail into my thoughts of the future of Amberley Green. There are three major points I wanted to discuss: the idea of a master plan for Amberley Green; the proposal from the JCC; and leveraging the Amberley Green property to support other development in the Village. Amberley Village needs to develop a master plan for Amberley Green. The Village hired a consulting firm, MKSK, to look at some of the options for development of Amberley Green, incorporating the needs of the JCC, maintaining the potential for future commercial development, while maintaining a park-like atmosphere. MKSK provided two concepts, and also compared the potential development to Blue Ash's Summit Park and NYC's Madison Square Park. Madison Square Park is not a very good development to compare to Amberley Green, as it is in a dense urban environment, and the economics of that development will be very different from Amberley Green. Summit Park is a bit better, but there are substantial differences. First, Summit Park is flat (it was a former airport). As such, development of the property is much easier and cheaper than Amberley Green. Also, there is substantial commercial development around Summit Park, which is critical when it comes to supporting development such as restaurants. This does not mean that development of Amberley Green is impossible, only that it is more challenging. MKSK's proposal to include commercial development (i.e. office complexes) may be the component that will make the rest of the development financially viable. MKSK included facilities for the JCC, but in a much smaller footprint than the JCC has proposed. MKSK has provided a good starting point for a master plan. It needs to be further developed to provide timelines, to identify funding mechanisms, and to gauge whether it meets the needs of all stakeholders, JCC, future occupants, and most importantly, Amberley residents. The Village should not move forward with any development until a master plan is completed. The proposal from the JCC to develop a substantial portion of Amberley Green to accommodate their summer camps should concern all Amberley residents. First, they are proposing to develop a substantial portion of the developable land (as identified by MKSK). It appears that they are "cherry-picking" the best portions of Amberley Green. Second, they are proposing to lease this property from the Village for $1 per year. While it was not clear what the length of the lease would be, it would be safe to assume they would want at least a 10 to 20 year lease. Lease terms such as this would represent a gift from the village to the JCC, and has all the markings of a sweetheart deal. The Village paid $8.7 million for the 133 acres, $65,414 per acre. The JCC proposes to use 30 acres, or $1.96 million worth of property. The Village should receive some return on its nearly $2 million investment. Lease terms (or sale price) should be at market rates. And if they want to develop the largest and best developable parcel, they should pay accordingly. Finally, the MKSK study included several items that will require substantial funds to complete. There are proposals for walking/biking trails along Ridge Road, paths from Fernwood Lane and Willowbrook Drive, and an alternative entrance from Galbraith Road at Knollcrest Drive. The Fernwood Lane and Willowbrook Drive paths provide access to Amberley Green for these neighborhoods. The path along Ridge Road would provide a safe means of passage within the Village for walkers and riders. (As a biker, I have ridden along Ridge three times over the 20+ years I have lived in Amberley. It scares me to death. And I regularly ride on major roads like Montgomery Road through Montgomery.) Some funding for these projects may be available through grants. But the bulk of the funding, including the alternative entrance, should be derived by leveraging the property the Village owns in Amberley Green. The Village has nearly $10 million invested in Amberley Green (original purchase, plus other expenses such as asbestos removal). An asset like this should be able to be leveraged to provide the types of amenities Village residents deserve given their investment. A $1 per year lease to the JCC is fiscally irresponsible, and will not help the village financially. In fact, such lease terms would make it virtually impossible to fund any other development in Amberley Green. A master plan is needed, one that provides a road map for development, and meets the needs of Amberley Village residents. Until this master plan is complete, Amberley Village Council should take no action with regard to the JCC development proposal. Again, I would like to thank Council for the opportunity to provide input on the Future of Amberley Green. If you have any questions regarding my comments, or if I can provide any assistance, please don't hesitate to contact me.	**25**	1	1			1		1	1	
It appears that the proposal is to allow a private entity to have free and exclusive use of our public asset. I see no advantage to the residents of Amberley, but an incredible gift to the JCC. Incredible, as in unbelievable. Please share the information you have. I'm sure that after two years of study you have come up with a better solution than giving away a valuable asset for $1/yr.	**26**	1								
This project seems to be the worst of both worlds. So-called "redevelopment" that changes the value of the space from one enjoyed by residents, particularly dog owners, without bringing in any much-needed direct revenue to the tax base.	**27**		1		1	1				
Very supportive of this plan to revitalize Amberley Green in partnership with the JCC. It will create a beautiful outdoor space for Amberley to be proud of, without negatively impacting the flow of traffic and attention to the area. The JCC has proven to be a strong partner to Amberley.	**28**			1				1		

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
The proposed JCC entrance directly across from my subdivision access street on Fairhaven Lane with a traffic light makes sense. That said, Fairhaven Lane connects Ridge to Galbraith and anticipated through traffic would increase despite traffic signs warning motorists to refrain from doing so during peak traffic hours. Permanent speed bumps could alleviate this. Who picks up the tab for this?	**29**		1				1			
As a member of the JCC I think this plan has merit. As a resident of Amberley Village I cant imagine why we would move forward with a plan that leases long-term a valuable plot for no substantial revenue. The plan is fine, the financial relationship with the JCC needs to be reconsidered or the green should remain free of tenants until we find a more profitable option.	**30**	1				1			1	
While I am in favor of some kind of reasonable development at Amberley Green, I have some serious concerns about the JCC as the prime mover and developer. I am a 20-year Amberley resident, and also have belonged to the J since its opening 11 years ago. Giving the J free reign over the Village properties is not in our best interests. They are a very secretive group (they refuse to publicize names of Board members even while EVERY OTHER JCC in the country does). There is too much mystery and secrecy surrounding their management (and please don't accuse me of anti-semistism; I am Jewish myself). Here are my concerns about the Green development plans: The pool(s) will be maintained by the J, and membership paid to the J. PLEASE DO NOT refer to this as a 'community pool' because it isn't. It's a JCC pool. Their maintenance of the current pool and hot tub at the facility is taken care of to an extent, but there are serious negatives to the current J pool (too short for serious swimmers, too few lanes for serious swimmers, overly-warm water that caters to the elderly and children, rust and mold issues). It is also an affront to give Amberley residents a discount for pool membership, but active J members still pay their regular dues with no discount... especially for seniors. Almost every JCC in the country has seniors at 65; our J makes us wait until we're 70. This is one more thing I find distasteful and untrustworthy on the part of the J management. For example: I attended the zoning meeting several years ago to protest the very bright sign on Ridge. At the hearings, the J was given every advantage and the decision was a forgone conclusion. The J did promise to turn off the sign and most of the parking lot lights after hours (once employees had left). They have done neither. I drive by that overly-bright sign at all hours, and it's as bright as can be all night long. This is one reason I simply don't trust the J and their cozy relationship with the Village. I think of the new development as a kind of Paul Brown Stadium... an expensive venture that is only used a few months of the year. This applies to football at PBS and to the pool/camp/community garden setup proposed for the Green. Is it truly worth developing this area for a mere three-month swim season and a two-month camp schedule? Who will maintain and police these areas in the roughly nine-month off-season? Security at the camp is a huge issue given the recent spate of attacks at Jewish locations across the country and the world. At least now the camp is behind the J with limited access to outsiders and semblance of security. Now you want to stick a camp in the middle of the Green? Insanity! What's to stop someone from walking onto the Green from any direction (Reading) when camp is in session and doing whatever kind of evil they have in mind? It's a guaranteed way to have a kidnapping situation. The J will 'fence it' as they proposed.... that should be lovely... a natural, rolling parkland cut up with unsightly and useless fencing. Finally, you are practicing very deceptive promotion for the development. You are showing the full development as a rendering when you only have funding for one small part (I refer to the most recent mailing from the Village showing the entire development completed). You need to make it more clear that this section is only one part, and by showing later phases and proposed future roadways and landscaping, you're not being honest with the residents of the Village. I am available for any questions or comments you may have regarding this letter.	**31**	1					1			
As a resident of Amberley who uses AG to walk I do NOT support the JCC's use IF I have to be a member of the JCC. The JCC membership for a single person is expensive. It would be a shame to lose access to AG.	**32**		1					1		
Thank you for providing information and seeking input at this stage. Please continue to keep the discussions, issues, costs and benefits transparent. The concept is a good one that could benefit both the JCC and the Village but the details of the lease and other agreements will be important. When future proposals are made I would want to know the planning costs, construction costs and lifetime maintenance costs to the Village along with the intangible benefits and revenue benefits (if any). I trust those who have tried to market the AG over the years and they believe this is a good use for the property, then the Village should pursue it further.	**33**		1			1	1		1	

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I have been in discussion with other residents and it seems this copy of issues best describes how I feel. After review of the proposed plan I see minimal potential benefits to Amberley Village and its residents. I must first address Village Focus Areas for 2019 listed in the Spring 2019 Newsletter: • Item 3 – Continue to look for ways to reduce costs and increase revenues o The Village council and administration does not seem focused on meeting a balanced budget. □ $230,000 overspend in 2018 □ $400,000 overspend projected in 2019 (174% increase) Based on the above facts, it appears the only way to resolve this financial situation is to increase revenue. Does the Amberley Green/JCC Plan help this in any substantial way? Not from what I can determine. • From public records, it indicates the Village purchased the 130 acres for ~$66,000/acre when we acquired the property. • The JCC's 30-acre commitment amounts to $1,980,000 worth of property which will be leased to the JCC for $1/year (makes no financial sense). The JCC continues to bring in revenue from its members through increased annual fees and other associated support. This property is also some of the "prime" real estate we are offering them. • It was indicated at the May 14 meeting that Amberley would receive additional tax revenue through JCC additional employees of $30,000 – $35,000 / year. This property will only be used for 3+ months. Revenue number seems suspect and needs to either be confirmed by JCC/Amberley or readjusted to realistic numbers. • It was also indicated at the May 14 meeting that the JCC would be responsible for demolition/remediation of the existing clubhouse even though they would not be leasing this acreage. At the May 16 meeting it was noted if Amberley were to take responsibility for this demolition, the cost would be ~$200,000. • For any development to occur, the existing clubhouse will need to be demolished. If the village were to take on this responsibility, the ROI could be recovered through the sale this prime acreage at current market pricing. • At the May 14 meeting it was also indicated that current maintenance of the property costs the Village ~$75,000/year ($50,000 for mowing + $25,000 for utilities). With the JCC plan, the Village would be able to reduce some of these costs which would amount to some minor savings. These numbers seem inflated and unrealistic and should be confirmed so we can truly see what our running costs are for the property and what any future savings truly might be. • It is noted in the FAQs (item #5) that the Village will ultimately have some financial responsibility for the JCC improvements, but these are not yet identified – these costs need to be determined • It has been noted the JCC wants to fast track this project and is ready to move on it now. If true, why has the village not started looking into future potential liabilities and costs if we agree to their proposal? • If this facility is up and running, how much of our current resources will be needed to support ongoing activities? Any new development will diminish/reduce current operations for the rest of the Village and residents (police, fire, etc.) Other items for discussion and review: • If you take a close look at what is proposed on the current plan (not to be confused with other plan options shown at the meeting), there really is not a lot of facilities/amenities being built. • To have pools, playing fields, tennis courts, etc. realistically does nothing for the aesthetics of the current property. • The JCC has selected the prime acreage (again for $1/year) for this project and has effectively blocked out other possible interested developers. • JCC should consider moving the entire planned development to the extreme southern and eastern boundaries while reconfiguring the amphitheater location. This will allow for better opportunities for other property development/revenue opportunities. • There is property available for development directly across the street from the JCC which could accommodate pools, tennis courts and playing fields. Has the JCC investigated buying this property? It would appear to have some advantages with the new development within close proximity to the existing campus. • While it is mentioned that there would be recreational advantages for the Village residents, this is really without merit, based on current Village demographics and existing facilities located within the village. Possible next steps: • Obtain current real-value estimates of the existing property so we know how to approach others who may want to purchase land and make real investments in Amberley, bringing in real estate taxes/earnings taxes, and enhance the Village as a whole. • New/actual real estate figures will help in making sensible financial decisions for the future wellbeing of the village. Summary statement: For the Village to bring this current proposal to the residents is disconcerting at best. More financial information could and should have been developed to show the real benefits and cost liabilities of moving forward on this plan.	**34**	1	1			1	1		1	

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I don't agree with giving the property to the JCC for $1 per year. According to you the village has financial issues that could use an infusion of the fair price or rent for the land. If they have the kind of resources ($20 million was mentioned) needed to develop their plan then it seems like several million to purchase or rent the land over time doesn't seem like a deal breaker. The village is the poor sister here, not the JCC. The argument that the JCC camp there will be an amenity for residents is questionable to me. It seems like more of an amenity for the JCC. Many residents already use Amberley Green, without the restrictions that will certainly come from JCC putting a large facility and wanting to make it secure. Putting in some kind of business park plus say restaurants at the western end of the property seems like a better goal to put effort into. That's a pretty good location in terms of access to Reagan expressway. I think the Gibson Greeting card property may be an albatross but I hope I'm proved wrong. The management of the company I work for helped sell our new location (Blue Ash) with access to restaurants, hotels, and recreation. The Gibson property isn't near any of that - it's not a desirable location. I keep hearing about Ridge Road being a limiting factor for trying to develop mixed use at the Amberley Green site. I'm not a planning professional but if Ridge could be widened between Galbraith and Reagan, then maybe that could open things up. Also the traffic snarls are mainly at rush hour, and while I'm not a planning professional, I wonder how much mixed use retail contributes to rush hour issues. Amberley has no safe East-West corridor for pedestrians or bicyclists. Section Road is deteriorating into a 3rd world horse path. I think fixing these issues should trump grandiose schemes for making the JCC more highly developed.	**35**	1	1	1						
A few questions and comments •What percentage of the total usable property is this portion? •What is the value proposition of leasing the JCC a portion of the property for $1/yr? •How many households does Amberley have? •Is this proposal going to define the benefits residents will get for giving up revenue? •What is the appraised value of the property if developed for best use and what would the cost be to develop it for such a use? •Are there other almost best uses that have a better net value after cost? •Has anyone done income analyses of different uses? •Will these be shared if already done or in the performed? •We have spent a lot of time and money on this property. I am a bit surprised we are only going to take a dollar a year.	**36**	1	1			1			1	

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I this is my 20th year as an Amberley resident. I am also a member of the JCC. I will start by saying I do support developing Amberley Green and having the JCC be a part of that development. My first priority is that of being an Amberley resident and not of being a JCC member. The JCC will do what it best for them, not necessarily what is best for Amberley. Although we can have a win-win situation, I do not feel that Amberley is getting the best deal possible. The JCC's position seems to be that by building their new outdoor pool and facilities that it will have a positive effect on our property values. Let's look at that closely. First, people move to an area for 3 major reasons: overall location, housing stock and the school system. Things like having sidewalks and recreational access do factor in, but they are simple not a big reason to move to an area. Look at the history of some of the recreational facilities in Amberley's past. Did our property values drop because the Amberley Swim Club closed? Did we lose prospective buyers simply because Crest Hills was no longer there? The answer to both is no. In the case of Crest Hills, some may point out that that was a private country club with restrictive membership that drew from the greater community. But is the JCC that much different? It has membership rates that are much higher than the YMCA, which is only an 5-8 minute drive away, [and the Brookside Swim Club]. And just like Crest Hills, the JCC is planning to draw from the greater community, not just Amberley. A closer pool isn't really going to have a big impact on our housing values. There are quite a few positive things with the JCC plan. The fact that they will tear down the club house, do some land improvements will be a savings to the Village. Personally, It would be nice to have an additional option for an outdoor pool. On the same hand, we can't ignore the fact that there will be an increase in traffic. More importantly, an increase for the Amberley Police department to protect, patrol and respond to emergencies at Amberley Green JCC. My concerns: I question whether the JCC will follow through with what they are proposing. Look at what they built 10 years ago. They have an indoor pool that is only 4 lanes and I believe, aren't even regulation width. [There are other problems with the pool, but only a lap swimmer would notice] But the real short sightedness of the building was their 20 yard outdoor pool. The overall design and size made it impractical for lap swimmers. I'm not even sure it functions well for the day camp. In fact, that is one of the reasons why we are here now. Their current outdoor pool is so bad, they need another to replace it. There is the question of funding for the new facility. Once again, looking at their last building, they ran over budget and I believe at one point had to stop construction do to funding issues. What happens if we approve the proposed plan and the JCC doesn't have the funds to complete it? I would really hate to see it half built or have a reduced modified plan due to funding issues. They are making many promises but can we get assurances to those plans? In exchange for tearing down the club house, walking paths available only in the off season, and the possibility of the amphitheater [I am unsure how access to that will work both during the summer and off season], the JCC will get roughly 30 acres for a lease of $1 a year. This is where I really have objections. According to the JCC, Amberley residents will get a "discounted membership" for the Amberley Green pool. But this is very misleading. If you belong to the JCC, you will automatically belong to Amberley Green. There is no discount. The discount offer is only benefit those who don't currently belong to the J and only want the outdoor pool. How many residents would that really benefit? It is a small number to be sure. [I won't go into the demographics of age and recreation membership rates] The true cost to the JCC would be minimal, as would the benefit to Amberley and its residents. The lease arrangement of a dollar with the "promise" of a discounted "pool only membership" is simply too low and Amberley is not getting the true value for what they are giving up. It might be a different case if Amberley residents got a discount on the regular J membership or if the leasing rate was more reflective of the property's value. You need to look at the added costs of increased police coverage. These costs are not only on going, but will increase in time. Some residents may express concern about the traffic impact. Having attended almost every meeting about Amberley Green [I think I did attend them all], I recognize that yes, there will be a traffic impact, but I think it is manageable. Any development at the Green would have some traffic impact. At Green meetings I was amazed at how the JCC really dragged their feet on presenting their plans. We kept hearing only generalities and "we'll get back to you after we meet with key people". Now that they have finally presented their plan, they want quick approval. Personally, I don't like being rushed into major decisions. We all know that when it is "now or never" you are better off going with never. In conclusion, while I support the plan in theory, I have serious reservations about the financial arrangements. The J is getting Amberley Green for too low of a price. And I define price as more than the $1 a year. Price is what they are willing to do for land improvements and facilities plus what the Village directly gains, either through memberships discounts or revenue from the arrangement. We must recognize that there are going to be increase costs for the Amberley Police and maintenance services. We are giving up a nice chunk of our land at a really low cost. Lastly, considering the JCC's track record, I am concerned about their funding sources and whether all of the proposal will be built. The JCC isn't known for its transparency on any issue. I would be more than happy to continue this conversation with the committee overseeing this.	**37**	1	1	1		1	1		1	
Thanks for the open house presentation. It was informative. My impression was that it is already a "done deal" with the JCC and any comments or suggestions of mine would be meaningless. I quit using the old golf course because of the dogs running free and jumping up on me.	**38**								1	
I love the idea of young children being able to have a larger swimming pool as a part of the jcc.The Amberley Green property would be perfect for holding swim meets. My Sister's and I grew up at the old Jewish Community Center and in Amberely, & loved participating in all of the swimming & diving contests. This sounds like a perfect match!	**39**		1							
Although I haven't heard anything official about the plan for the JCC to use part of Amberley Green (i believe for camp?) I am very much in support of it. The green has become an overgrown eyesore and such a waste of beautiful space. The J has proven to be an asset to our community and responsible in their ideas/development of the community.	**40**									
Traffic light on Ridge – Is 1 planned? It wiil create huge rush hour ttraf. jams. Thanks.	**41**			1						

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I'm sure that finding a developer for Amberley Green that is suitable to everyone is a difficult task. I must say though that I would prefer the status quo rather than give it away. I just don't see how the pro's outweigh the con's in the current JCC proposal. I see this is a grab by the JCC and believe that the taxpayers are being raked. I am not alone in my position that if this proposal is accepted, I will never support another tax levy in the Village. I would prefer a mixed use proposal that would generate real income. There has to be a better solution.	**42**	1				1				
I suggest a light or 4-way stop at Fairhaven. Discount price for AV residents Pool open on Friday evenings I don't really like the idea of "renting for free" to a religious organizations. They already get tax breaks and now "free land." I wonder who else might be interested if they knew the land was FREE. Some groups of Jewish are so exclusive and unwelcoming and make it clear it's a Jewish place and they simply tolerate others. These folks need some advice on being good neighbors. So I suggest offering this space to the public…if no one else wants it then allow it to happen…Please offer "free land" to look for other opportunities. If JCC would pay rent…that would feel different.	**43**	1	1	1		1				
We have a serious traffic problem that needs to be addressed before anything goes forward. When I asked how much parking JCC was planning I was told "plenty." When I asked how much again I received the same answer – that's not satisfactory! Is there any monetary return to Amberley? Who decided $1.00 a year leasing fee was adequate and why?	**44**	1		1		1			1	
2 Willowbrook Lanes with AV green space between. Not shown on connectivity plan. Consider small easement (donation?) on S. Willowbrook Ln. side to access green space and then to shown link to AG	**45**		1							
No financial benefit for the Village. Consider high-end condos or cluster housing such as what has been done by Mariemont and Hyde Park. Big demand for this for empty nesters. Council needs to consider residents feelings on subjects before letting a $8.7 million asset be leased for no revenue to the Village.	**46**	1	1			1				
Eager to see development on Green. Plan looks good. *Eager to see walking path/sidewalks/safe walking paths from Rollman into neighboring areas/parks. Would like to see dog park, gazebos/picnic areas, benches; prefer "open field" to baseball diamond; would like an amphitheater	**47**				1					
Increase walking trails; maintain trees, many are in poor shape; map & trails	**48**							1		
Suggest using undevelopable land areas as an equestrian center for be leased to AV operator who will provide programs such as therapeutic riding, ancillary to the JCC programs and possibly public riding by the hour or longer. The hilly terrain would be much more interesting for some riders than traditional riding "rings" and lends itself to trail rides and enjoying nature.	**49**									
I would be in favor of JCC developing part of Amberley Green if use of the facilities is shared with the residents of Amberley Village at no cost or at a minimal cost, especially if the JCC leased the land for only $1.00/year. It would be beneficial to the residents of the Village if the cost was minimal, i.e. like the Blue Ash, Mason, etc. community centers charge. If they (JCC) leased the land for higher price then that would also provide more tax revenue for the Village. Other thoughts on development of the land could be a restaurant on site of the old clubhouse. Development of the land as what has been done at Summit Park (mixed use, but open for all to use.) If the JCC is not willing to share the land and the facilities it creates then I would not so much be in favor of the joint venture. I very much enjoy the park-like atmosphere and walking paths as they currently exist. Expect that users of the grounds who have dogs need to keep them under better control. A fenced-in dog park might be a partial answer to that problem.	**50**	1	1		1	1				
Great ideas on the designs Recommendations: • JCC would need to provide & pay for all utilities • JCC would allow Amberley to use the facilities whenever the JCC is not using it (ex: amphitheater) • If Amberley allows the JCC to use the land and lease for $1/year, all Amberley residents can use the facilities for a very nominal yearly fee (<$20) • If the JCC decides not to allow residents access to the new facilities, Amberley should charge $500k to the J • Please buy the few buildings/lot on Galbraith in order ot get across to Galbraith from the park/land • Most importantly, we need to increase the revenue in the Village. Allow the JCC to do what they would like for the 30 acres. The remaining 60+ acres should be used for getting a company to come in a build a building. And use the Galbraith access to provide quick access to Cross County	**51**		1	1		1	1			
-concern for how development will impact property values along Galbraith as well as Ridge -would request more significant tree line buffer in front of all houses -traffic flow on both Ridge & Galbraith is heavy already and will like escalate further with all proposed plans	**52**		1	1						
-concerned about building a housing complex across from Galbraith. Also what that will do to traffic on Galbraith as already busy road? Will this decrease the value of homes on Galbraith Road? -If JCC plan is approved would like to see more trees planted as a barrier between Galbraith Road and park.	**53**		1	1						

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
I would like to see a splash area that is open to all for kids to enjoy; near the pool, but still separate so everyone can enjoy. I would also like to see the multi-use pathway be extended south past Section Road to meet the sidewalk in Pleasant Ridge. Would also like to see the path wrap around on Section Road and into the main entrance of French Park. One pedestrian bridge over Ridge Road into the Green would be safer for crossing. Lastly, some picnic tables out in the Village Commons to enjoy the outdoors. And a hiking path around the grounds or the ponds for exercise.	**54**		1							
Fantastic ideas! I love the paths, common areas and "new urbanist" housing concepts. Amberley could transform into a real community with lots of opportunities for interaction	**55**		1							
•(#16) Tree buffer needs to go down Burning Tree for homes impacted for privacy and sound •Lighting? Will it impact homes on Burning Tree? •Encourage old tennis court are to be restaurant/bar for coming together	**56**								1	
•I will be very supportive of the JCC Development Plan •I would be very supportive of senior lifestyle homes developed on the Green. We are at the phase and would love not to have to leave Amberley •I would be supportive of multi-path that connect JCC/Greens/French Park	**57**									
I would have preferred a short presentation/overview before reviewing all the posters. My main concern is to be sure AV is very clear on the financial burden that would be incurred before entering into the agreement. I question why the lease is $1/year. Is the income taxes or other revenues such that there is no worry about dollars? I also want to see AV residents well-served by any arrangements. I am JCC worked so I want to see the J expand, but I am concerned about AV residents who are not members benefitting – for example, can AV residents use the bandshell (?)/pool in meaningful ways – not just via a guest pass.	**58**	1	1			1				
Need to move amphitheater to MKSK plan Concept A = avoids reflection of sound to residential property	**59**									
Will there be any way to keep the garden? Water source will be removed when our source (building roof) is demolished. The garden is a big feature to residents in Amberley and outside Amberley,. It would be a good thing to consider its placement (down the road).. A lot of good soil is in it and all would be lost if were to be removed.	**60**		1							
We hope this happens! All of this seems to be a great benefit to Amberley Village.	**61**		1							
I'd like to see a mixed-use development, housing, commercial and the JCC plan. I support increasing the density, if necessary, to aid in accommodating an aging population.	**62**					1				
•What are hours of availability to AV residents? •Take a poll of possible developers' opinions of this "addition" along the road	**63**		1						1	
Community Garden – Community & Camp -Affiliated with Civic Garden Center Millcreek Alliance (MCA) – water shed/drainage (formerly Millcreek Watershed Council of Community) looked at headwaters on this site and expressed interest. Love connectivity study findings!	**64**								1	
I like most ideas I see, including: multi-use trail (east side of Ridge), JCC involvement/pools, trail connectivity to other track, elimination of dog "free for all" at Amberley Green. Things not desirable: parking lots, paving a huge area of Ridge & Galbraith (corner). This will change character of this area.	**65**		1	1	1					
I like the idea of a camp/playground especially if Village residents could have access to them at various times. My primary concern would be increase in traffic especially on Ridge. At certain times of day it can be almost impossible to turn left out of Burning Tree. When the original lawsuit was filed I was opposed to making all of Crest Hills residential. Now that I'm older I might be more interested in some type of condos rather than single family houses.	**66**		1	1						
I like the idea of a connector walking path on the east side of Ridge Road. I like the JCC's plan!	**67**									
Please, please, please leave a significant portion of the property for use as walking trails with dogs allowed off leash. It is a joy to watch the dogs exercise and play. I don't know of any place nearly that provides this opportunity. A fenced0in dog park is not the same as walking in an open area with your dog. The walking path along Ridge to access the Green would be a great improvement, including crosswalks to safely cross Ridge Road.	**68**				1					

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
The Green is the envy of folks that now enjoy it – residents and non-residents. Please maintain the non-leash dog walking opportunity. Please avoid a small fenced area for dogs as these are not pleasant to use for owner or dog. Let me know if I can assist with any of the development plans. Ie Development & Land Use Agreement I like the idea of a walking path along Ridge Road. I prefer the AV use plan versus the JCC plan for the area closest to Ridge traffic – I like the movement of the park entrance. Longmeadow and Appleridge Lane intersection – I recommend a flashing light be installed to operate as follows: •Caution for Ridge traffic during light vehicle times •Red/Stop for Ridge traffic during high vehicle volume (7:15 – 9 am; 3:30 – 6:30 pm) •Red/Stop for Appleridge & Longmeadow at all times	**69**		1	1	1					
Concept "A" shows two new traffic lights on Galbraith. I would not want a traffic light in front of my house if I lived on Galbraith Any thoughts to widening Ridge Road? Revenue generating uses – Mercy Health is already causing too much traffic.	**70**			1		1				
I like the JCC plan. I like all the additions it will provide – common area, amphitheater, etc. Thumbs up!	**71**		1							
After receiving the tentative JCC master plan, it is a "win-win" situation for the JCC and Amberley. The JCC plan maintains significant green space in a park-like setting; this is what I want to see as a resident of Amberley. The JCC and Amberley should commence negotiation as soon as possible to resolve any lingering details (we all know the devil is always in the details.) As a quid pro quo for the deal, Amberley should insist that the JCC demolish the former clubhouse at their cost; allow access to the new facilities to Amberley residents at a discounted rate; jointly construct a dog park; provide for landscaping along perimeter streets; and negotiate a reasonable lease agreement in excess of $1 per year. Keeping in mind Amberley's financial situation, it is economically unfeasible to construct roads to alleviate traffic congestion when costs may exceed $800,000 +. Note: Scot thanks for the presentation on Thursday evening. It is always a pleasure working with you. I am confident that as the manager, you always have Amberley's best interests at heart!	**72**	1	1		1			1		
It looks to be an impressive project. I am very excited to see it happen. Glad that they are involved swimming experts to make sure that the pool is regulation size. It provides many of the same features that other communities have.	**73**		1							
Love the proposed JCC plan •Pro sidewalk/walkway on Ridge from Section to JCC •I'm concerned about crosswalks specific to safety and rush hour traffic •Would prefer current clubhouse being saved. I have a hard time understanding how building new in this ## makes sense •Would be nice to have a community fishing pond	**74**			1						
Amphitheater sound, lights, can it be moved? Is it necessary? Could it be for camp only?	**75**								1	
We like the idea of developing Amberley Green into useful community space, especially the playground and pools. I like the idea of wider and better walking trails through the spaces (which I didn't necessarily see in this proposal). I also like the idea of the walking path connecting the JCC to Section. That is very appealing to us. Questions I have about the JCC proposal are about the details: how much parking – what hours can residents use certain facilities, are other areas always accessible? How will maintenance costs be divided? I think a well-developed park space would make the neighborhood even more appealing – especially for young families. I think of Summit Park in Blue Ash and what a draw that is. In general, I think there is a lot of potential for a win-win with the JCC plan as long as the details would be favorable enough to Amberley.	**76**		1				1		1	
Does the project generate revenue for the Village? Does the project impact property taxes? Will residents still have access to the property? Will residents have access to the new facilities? Will residents incur costs for this project? How will traffic on Ridge Ave. be affected? Who decides if the project goes ahead? How? When?	**77**		1	1		1	1		1	
We are greatly concerned about the amphitheater in our back yard! Concerns include noise, lights and crowds of people, especially if the space is rented out, which would bring in non-Amberley residents. We currently have strangers walking our property from Amberley Green and this would exacerbate the problem! It is a security issue, and it affects the property values on our street, and on other streets that abut Amberley Green. Please move the amphitheater to another location on the property away from our homes!	**78**									

Open-ended question 1										
General Feedback on Amberley Green/JCC Proposal	**Reply #**	$1 lease	Benefits/Amenities for Residents	Traffic	Dog Park	Revenue Generation	Future Cost/Maintenance	Value Green Space	Need more information	Total Response Category Count
Total respondents who answered X	**87**	**32**	**51**	**23**	**14**	**33**	**21**	**11**	**23**	**208**
% of respondents who answered X		**15%**	**25%**	**11%**	**7%**	**16%**	**10%**	**5%**	**11%**	
The village needs to be revenue neutral to positive cash generation for the use of the Green. In other words, the rent for the property needs to be more than $1. The JCC land usage needs to have a smaller footprint, closer to the alternative plan footprints (MKSK proposal.) Village needs to take a 20-year vision for the Green. How Bechthold Park is being developed is a good example. Over 20 years, they slowly acquired properties to meet their vision.	**79**	1				1				
I am concerned that JCC is cherry picking the site, proposing to use a very large chunk of developable land. Their use and development should be consistent with the concepts developed by MKSK. Of the two MKSK proposals, I would favor Concept A. The suggestion to lease property to the JCC for $1 per year is completely unacceptable. If the Village maintains ownership of the property, lease terms should be at market rates. The Village should look to leverage the Amberley Green property to pay for the multi-use trails and the Knollcrest entrance.	**80**	1				1				
1.) Connector from Fernwood – concern Fernwood will become parking lot 2.)What will happen to path right behind old clubhouse? 3.)Money saved from smaller property to mow/upkeep, or money from lease revenue should be earmarked for tree/trail/Green improvements	**81**			1			1		1	
My major concern is the lease agreement – undervalued. I'm not a member of JCC so this is of NO benefit to me. Would prefer a more community-inclusive use of the property.	**82**	1	1							
This is an exciting concept. I would be cautious of doing anything that excludes current Amberley residents from using these facilities. I hope that this can all be accomplished without taxing the city administration financially and otherwise. What about insurance, liability, police presence, etc?	**83**		1				1			
We are in favor of the JCC's plan for Amberley Green.	**84**									
The JCC is a lovely organization and serves an important function in Amberley; that said I feel like if the village allows a nonprofit to take over the prime sections of its most valuable piece of property without even trying to entertain other possibilities, it is being outrageously, fiscally foolish. Do you notice how crowded the French Park house is every single weekend in spring, summer and fall? Don't you think it would make a LOT more sense to put an event center on the site of the old clubhouse and rent it out for weddings, bar- and bat-mitzvahs and other events? The JCC could still have some portion of the land, but the clubhouse location, with its sweeping sunset vistas, is prime real estate. Even if you granted an initial tax abatement to whomever developed the new clubhouse / event center, eventually it would generate revenue. I respect all of you as human beings and applaud your commitment and dedication to the village, and yet I am continually befuddled by your seeming lack of foresight when it comes to this property. It has been nothing but an eyesore since the Village bought it and now, if you take this deal, it will never generate any revenue, as residents were originally led to believe it could. I understand the village is flush with cash right now, thanks to a thriving economy and all of our tax dollars, but those of us who lived through the recession in Amberley know how quickly that can dissipate. Given how cyclical history is, I believe it is fiscally imprudent to just give the prime parts of this property away without trying to develop them ourselves first	**85**	1				1				
As a citizen of amberly village I would like to express my belief that the amberly green remain undeveloped, but more vigorous maintenance occurs.	**86**							1		
Sorry for sending this kind of late, but I saw a bit of information coming of the Amberley Green meeting and I thought I need to add my two cents. First, I am fully supportive of the JCC project. I think it is great for the community, particularly those of us with children. If I have one suggestion, it would be simply to put the park portion of the project as close to twigwood as possible. I have heard there is a way to cut through and I think it would be nice to have a park walkable from a portion of the community. On a separate but related note, I was wondering if Amberley had ever thought of somehow making there meetings available to on-line participation in some capacity (possibly through live streaming with the ability to submit questions and comments). I heard that this meeting, like many others, was filled with a population that is older and more change averse than the general population of the village. This makes sense in light of the fact that individuals with children don't have the same ability to get to these kind of meetings as individuals with less commitments. My experience living in the community seems to be that the fact that older individuals who have more time to attend meetings (and generally to call Amberley to gripe about minutae) has a negative of impact on the communities responsiveness to the desires of families. So I thought I would throw out a potentially constructive way to address this. I appreciate everything you do for our village and the work that has been done so far on moving forward with the JCC project. I really hope that everything is done to move it forward as fast as possible	**87**		1							