



WHHA July 24 Meeting Feedback on Z-25-000021 Zoning Application

To:

Councilwoman Gay Donnell Willis
District 13 City Plan Commissioner Larry Hall
VP of Sales for Crescent Estates, Leonel Amaya

As requested by the Councilwoman, WHHA convened a meeting of its members on 7/24/2025 at the Walnut Hill Recreation Center to accomplish three primary goals:

- To share the latest version of the proposed development proposal,
- To gather feedback on the most current version of the development proposal, and
- To inform the neighbors about the City of Dallas planning process.

Attendance at the meeting was predictably strong with 84 neighbors attending. In preparation, we worked with Mr. Amaya to develop a detailed list of all modifications made to his original plan since it was presented in his June 26 meeting. A summary table of those modifications is presented on the next page. We presented this table at the July 24 meeting and we discussed each element with the neighbors. As the Councilwoman requested, we did not discuss any alternative development plans in the July 24 meeting since Mr. Amaya is not considering any at this time.

After reviewing the plan modifications that Crescent Estates has made to date, we spent the bulk of the meeting gathering neighbor input/feedback and developing specific recommendations on all elements of the current proposal, which we provide in this comment letter following the table. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss these recommendations.



Table of Modifications from Original Development Proposal to Current Development Proposal

Category	Original Plan (6/26)	Revised Plan (7/24)
Density	60 homes	50 homes
Lot Size	1,550 SQ FT	3,970 SQ FT along northern property line 1,650 SQ FT across remainder of development
Max Building Height and Sight Line Restrictions	45 FT, 3 story	30 FT 2 story along northern property line 36 FT remainder of development No rear facing windows on 3 rd floor
Set Back	10 FT	14 FT along northern property line
Open Space	10.4%	14.7%
Drainage		2 retention ponds added



WHHA NEIGHBOR FEEDBACK

1. Comparables

a. What we heard

- i. Many of our neighbors continue to reference the development at Melshire Estates (PD1060/Ordinance #31993) and believe that the Betty Jane/Walnut Hill (BJ/WH) development should be required to follow similar guidelines to those required for Melshire Estates. Neighbors feel that the specifications for Melshire Estates (including number of units, lot size, sight line restrictions, limit to 2 stories, building height, etc.) are much more in line with the idea of "gentle density" than the proposal being considered for the BJ/WH site. Neighbors are frustrated by not getting a clear answer why the development standards applied for the Melshire Estates development were not used for the BJ/WH development in our neighborhood.
- ii. Neighbors are similarly wondering why the BJ/WH development is in no way affected by the precedent set by Walnut Meadows, zoned as R5 with 2 story homes, the most dense development in our area.

b. Recommendation

- i. Please provide an explanation why the Melshire Estates development has substantially better specifications (including density, lot size, limit to number of stories, sight line restrictions, etc.) than what is being considered for the the BJ/WH development.

2. Density

a. What we heard

- i. While the majority of neighbors attending this meeting are willing to support gentle density at the BJ/WH site, they are very frustrated that that the city has not yet provided a definition for what constitutes "gentle density."
- ii. The majority of meeting attendees do NOT support the level of density in the current proposal and believe that the development in its current form is drastically not in sync with the character of our neighborhood. Note: It was pointed out that there are no R-5a developments within 6 miles of the proposed site.



- iii. The neighbors expressed extreme frustration and anger that the city could possibly consider the current proposal to be gentle density since there is no development in all of District 13 with density even remotely comparable to that of the proposed development.
- iv. The neighbors point out that the current proposal for the BJ/WH site is actually more dense than even TH-3 Zoning.

Property	TH-3 Zoning	Crescent Estates	Melshire Estates
Total Acreage		3.746 Acres	3.456 Acres
Total Units		50 Units	26 Units
Units per Acre	12 units per Acre	13.4 Units per Acre	7.5 Units per Acre
Min. Lot Size	2,000 SF	1,550 SF	4,600 SF
Max. Height	36 Feet/3-Story	36 Feet (39 Units) and 30 Feet (11 Units)	30 Feet/2-Story for All Units

b. Recommendations

- i. The neighbors want the total number of homes in the BJ/WH development to be much closer to the 26 homes in Melshire Estates, which would make the minimum lots size also be much closer to the 4,600sf in Melshire Estates.
- ii. Lots on the northern border of the BJ/WH site should be larger in size than the other lots in the development.

3. Max Height

a. What we heard

- i. The neighbors want the homes in the BJ/WH development to be limited to 2 stories throughout. They do not want the BJ/WH development to include any 3 story homes. They repeatedly cited that there are no 3-story single family residences anywhere in the Walnut Hill neighborhood or in any of our surrounding neighborhoods.

b. Recommendations

- i. Neighbors want the maximum height limit for all units in the development to be restricted to 30 feet and two-stories, as the current proposal shows only for the homes along the northern border of the site.



4. Sight Line Restrictions

a. What we heard

- i. While the current plan reflects that there will be no rear facing windows on the 3rd floor, neighbors find this strongly insufficient. They maintain that the new homes will have direct line of sight into their properties even from the 2nd floor.

b. Recommendations

- i. The neighbors want this development to have identical second floor sight line restrictions as those found in the Melshire Estates property zoning ordinance to help protect privacy for neighbors in adjacent homes.

5. Parking

a. What we heard

- i. The space allotted for guest parking in the current proposal, 15 guest spots, is drastically insufficient and exacerbated by the fact that the homes in the current proposal have no driveways.
- ii. There are no driveways in the current plan, so there is no ability for guests to park in a driveway. There is also no street parking. (The proposed street width of 26 feet, the minimum required for fire lanes, is too narrow to allow for any street parking).
- iii. In the current proposal, the garages are not big enough to fit an oversize vehicle such as a large truck. This will result in residents with large vehicles using some of the already miniscule number of guest parking spots, making guest parking even more problematic.
- iv. Neighbors are very concerned that overflow parking will spill onto Betty Jane Lane and Wimberley Court. Betty Jane Lane is a small, 2 lane blacktop road with no curbs or sidewalks and significant ditches on either side that flood with every heavy rain. This is not conducive to street parking. Residents of Wimberley Court fear that excess parking may fill their tiny, cul-de-sac street, giving them congestion and forcing them to look at cars parked in front of their homes, and introducing issues of safety and noise.



b. Recommendations

- i. If the number of units in the development is reduced as requested, average lot size will increase and each unit should be given a driveway. That will instantly enable at least 1 guest parking spot per unit and it will allow residents with oversize vehicles to park in their own driveway.
- ii. Improvements, such as curbs, sidewalks, fixing ditches, adding speedbumps, etc., will need to be made on Betty Jane Lane to address increased traffic.

6. Traffic

a. What we heard

- i. There absolutely must be an entrance and exit to the development from both directions on Walnut Hill Lane. While the city has stated this requirement, neighbors have not yet seen what this will look like or how it will be done.
- ii. Neighbors are concerned about increased levels of traffic on Betty Jane Lane, since it is a very small, 2-lane blacktop road, already in poor condition, with no sidewalks or curbs, and with large ditches on each side that turn into ponds with every significant rain incident.
- iii. The developer has responded to neighbor concerns by initiating a traffic study on Betty Jane Lane, which the neighborhood acknowledges is optional and voluntary on the developer's part. Traffic counters appear to be installed now. However, neighbors have voiced that any traffic counts on Betty Jane during the months of June or July are essentially meaningless because they in no way represent the actual traffic patterns since school is not in session now. Betty Jane Lane has considerable school traffic from the following:
 - 1. students going to Walnut Hill International Leadership Academy and Thomas Jefferson High School
 - 2. families in the immediate neighborhood bringing children to schools outside the immediate neighborhood
 - 3. families dropping off children at the Creative School Pre-K, entrance on Betty Jane Lane



b. Recommendations

- i. Neighbors feel that it is critical that there is a turnout on Walnut Hill Lane to provide ingress/egress to the development from both directions on Walnut Hill as the primary entry to the property.
- ii. There should be a dedicated turnout lane onto Betty Jane Lane to accommodate increased traffic turning in. Without that, vehicles on Walnut Hill turning left to Betty Jane will be waiting to turn and obstructing a functioning lane on Walnut Hill.

7. Appearance

a. What we heard

- i. Neighbors are concerned about the quality of the exterior materials being used throughout the development. Crescent Estates has stated that a minimum of 60% of the exterior of each unit is required to be masonry (stone or brick). Neighbors want as much masonry as possible to reduce the risk of the units looking dilapidated over time.
- ii. Even if the developer reduces the number of units and is selling high-end units, neighbors are concerned about the drastic difference in appearance in the transition between the surrounding neighborhood and the new development.

b. Recommendations

- i. Neighbors would like the development to be enclosed/surrounded by the same kind of 8-foot masonry wall that was required for both the Walnut Meadows development and the new Melshire Estates development.
- ii. Gates, including appropriately sized turnouts, should control access to the development at both Betty Jane Lane and Walnut Hill Lane entrances.
- iii. Neighbors would like Crescent Estates to make the entire exterior (100%) have masonry and no siding used, vs. the proposed plan for 60% masonry and 40% siding.

8. Rental Property

a. What we heard

- i. Neighbors are concerned that Crescent Estates would sell units to entities who would use them as rentals.
- ii. Crescent Estates has stated that they cap rental units at 5% of total units. However, this is a concern because that is a Crescent-specific company policy and is not stated in writing anywhere relative to this development.



b. Recommendations

The zoning proposal must specifically state in writing that the number of units to be sold for rental is capped at 5%.

9. Landscaping/Lighting

a. What we heard

- i. The tree allocation in the current proposal is unclear. It has been communicated that each lot will be given 2 trees, but it is unclear if that is for all 50 units in the current proposal. It is also unclear where/how those 2 trees per lot will be located in each lot.
- ii. It was also communicated that current proposal allows for each lot along the northern border to be allocated one 3" caliper tree along the side of the lot bordering Wimberley Court to help mitigate sightline and privacy concerns. (A 3" caliper tree is considered to be a larger tree.) Neighbors along this northern border feel that one tree is insufficient to address their privacy concerns. At best it would be years before that one 3" caliper tree could provide privacy, and even so, it would not cover their entire yard.
- iii. Neighbors want to see the landscape and lighting plans for the development prior to the CPC Hearing on August 21, 2025 to allow the neighborhood sufficient time to review and comment on this critical aspect of the development.

b. Recommendations

- i. Neighbors along the northern and eastern borders would like to see 3" caliper trees installed every 20'.
- ii. Developer should be required to provide landscape and lighting plans prior (at least 5 business days) to the CPC hearing to allow sufficient time for neighborhood review and comment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

The Walnut Hill Homeowners Association Board