Summary of Input & Comments from the Small-Group Workshop Session

Introduction

The following is a summary of input provided by participants during the small group session at the Places29 Workshop on Saturday, May 20, 2006. Comments and other input were taken from each table’s Workbooks (including its maps). Please note that comments from the Open House held Thursday, May 18, 2006, are available in a separate summary.

The summary is organized by table-number (there were 9 tables). The first part of each table summary is divided into three subsections, one for each of the presented Future Framework Alternatives (1, 2, and 3). It reflects the small group’s comments with respect to the questions listed for each alternative:

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?
3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?
5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

Some participants posted (additional) comments directly on the framework maps. These have been “collated” into comments under the questions listed above to the extent possible. Comments from maps are identified by the annotation: [Map Comment].

The second part of each summary reflects the group’s input on the “Comparison of All Three Alternatives.” This input is provided in table format similar to the one provided in the Workbook. Consensus items identified by members of each group with an orange colored marker are grouped under a “Consensus Item(s)” heading after each applicable question and highlighted in bold in the comparison tables. The comparison table contains the following questions:
1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?
2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?
3. Which major transit routing works best?
4. Which multimodal road network will best support the Places29 Vision & Guiding Principles?
   Consider:
   - Transportation choices: driving, biking riding transit and walking
   - Efficient and accessible
5. Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   Consider:
   - Compact development
   - Mix of uses
   - Walkable pattern
6. Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a change in the boundary if it helped obtain an essential part of the road network?
7. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners’ associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?
8. Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative.

Throughout the summary, comments or clarifications by the preparers of this document are shown in [square brackets].

Following the morning session, some of the participants stayed for a Post-lunch discussion. Where all or most of the participants at a table remained, their comments are included at the end.
COMMENTS ON SKETCH FRAMEWORK CONCEPTS

Group 7

Framework 1

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - Yes, for the most part
   - Just widening US 29 rather than additional parallel roads reduces alternative choices of choosing routes to get to where you want to drive to; reduces reliability to get to your destination in a reliable amount of time

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?
   - Don’t believe everyone will want to walk (maybe for exercise but not to stores and services)
   - Centers are too close together in the Hollymead area
   - Centers more spread out in Neighborhood 1 are good
   - Concern about how much people actually would walk. Consider best ways to make walking practical and helpful. Existing walking patterns might change, but not just because there’s a sidewalk

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
   - Residential near airport might be more appropriate as mixed use
   - Placing grocery stores, etc. is a poor idea, leading to excessive driving congestion
   - Proffit Road/US 29—bit too dense urban development

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?
   - Not enough parallel roads
   - Too much focus on US 29. More parallel [roads].

Consensus Items:
   - Widen US 29 from South Fork to North Fork of the River. This needs to be done regardless of scenario
   - Widen US 29 from South Fork to Hollymead [Map Comment]

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
   - No, not enough parallel roads
   - Only if curves on Griffith [unclear] Road were straightened and road widened without affecting existing properties
6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

- Infrastructure such as roads and various modes of transportation must be in place prior to residential development

**Consensus Item:**
- Can be nice to have the clear break between major development areas so it’s not solid sprawl

**Framework 2**

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward roads parallel to US 29). Note that Alternative 2 features a “Midtown.”
   - Keep centers toward southern part of US 29

**Consensus Items:**
- Midtown location OK
- Like Midtown location, but improve accessibility [Map Comment]

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
   - Could industrial area between Lewis and Clark Drive and US 29 swap land uses with new urban residential development north of Airport Road? [Map Comment]
   - Good tradeoff with area by airport not developed [Map Comment]
   - Not a good tradeoff (see comment above) because more development on US 29 and “rural” tradeoff near airport isn’t really going to provide more rural flavor [Map Comment]
   - Prefer for there not to be development north of proposed Polo Grounds Road because it would be adjacent to the river [Map Comment]

**Consensus Items:**
- Don’t like residential along Airport Road next to industrial areas. Less dense.
- Like redevelopment along Hillsdale Drive near Destination Center [Map Comment]
- New urban residential area north of Airport road should be multi-use [Map Comment]

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—the parallel roads and cross connections?
   - Parallel roads—Great!!
   - Northern Free State Road is a good idea
   - Need non-intersection [grade-separated] crossings across US 29
Crossing US 29 to get to transit; farther from home density; put stops along parallel road east of US 29 [Map Comment]

Consider moving the transit crossing of US 29 to the south where houses [residential homes] are [Map Comment]

**Consensus Items:**

- Lack of cross-connection from east to west at US 29 in Hollymead
- Move public transit stops east of US 29 near Hollymead or put it on both sides
- Extensions (Berkmar, Northern Free State and Polo Grounds) will take load off US 29 [Map Comment]
- Drive quality more pleasant [Map Comment]

5. **Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?**

- Earlysville Road requires some improvement in the Places29 project

**Consensus Items:**

- Transit needs to cross US 29 south of Hollymead so it can be accessed on both east and west sides [Map Comment]
- Need non-intersection [grade-separated] crossovers of US 29 connecting east and west for peds and bikes [Map Comment]

6. **Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.**

- Transportation infrastructure should be in place prior to major residential/business development.

**Consensus Item:**

- Like focus on redevelopment as opposed to new development
Framework 3

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - Is too broad

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (more clustered than in Alternative 2, focused on US 29 and roads between US 29 and parallel roads). Note that Alternative 2 features an “Uptown.”
   - Don’t like the Uptown Center. Don’t create more congestion around the airport

Consensus Items:
   - Development [Area] tradeoff with west of US 29 at Ashwood [Blvd.]; better because less of an impact
   - Maybe bridge overpass/underpass (for cars, bike, ped) east-west that is NOT an intersection with US 29. Maybe in the Hollymead area.
   - Uptown Center: Nice idea, but too large [Map Comment]

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
   - Uptown [at] airport between Airport Road and US 29 better here.
   - Pineridge is a good residential land use; keeps traffic off of Proffit Road
   - [Alternative has] More Neighborhood Service Centers to serve employee use in Uptown area (restaurants, convenience shops, etc.) that employees might walk to during the day

Consensus Items:
   - Like area along US 29 south of Hollymead Town Center [Map Comment]
   - Like Pineridge area density [Map Comment]

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvement—including the parallel road to serve development north of the South Fork of the Rivanna?
   - US 29 needs to be widened along entire length—don’t leave it four lanes
   - Eastern parallel roads are needed, like Free State Road
   - If you have major Uptown development and the major housing at Hollymead there will need to be some small scale transit within Uptown area and across US 29, so [that there is] not so much driving across US 29
   - This alternative does not include the extension of Meadowcreek Parkway to US 29. An eastern parallel road should be included.
   - What about streetcars crossing US 29 connecting Forest Lakes to the Hollymead shopping center?

Consensus Item:
   - Need connector between Neighborhood 2 and Polo Grounds Road [Map Comment]
5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
   - Crossing US 29 on bike or foot has to be safe to expect people not to drive or even access transit (really busy—ped bridge?)
   - Crossing US 29 in cars [is] insuff.[erable?]
   - Could use local transit to shuttle across US 29 in areas like Neighborhood 1.

**Consensus Item:**
- Non-intersection [grade-separated] crossings of US 29 [Map Comment]

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

**Consensus Item:**
- Keep area around Rio Mills Road open [Map Comment]
Comparison of All Three Alternatives

Note: Consensus Items circled in the original Workbook are identified here by **bold** type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?</td>
<td>Eliminate Destination Center at North Pointe in favor of smaller Uptown center west of US 29</td>
<td>More lower density residence in Pritchett area. Like North Pointe here better than in Framework 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?</td>
<td>To have Midtown, major accessible major improvement at Rio Road and US 29.</td>
<td>Higher density center is not as good as Midtown Concept good but something smaller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which major transit routing works best?</td>
<td>Like Northern Free State Road connector because good system of parallel roads takes traffic off 20, 29, Proffit Road; alternate way to get from Hollymead to downtown [Charlottesville] Like parallel roads. US 29 still needs widening/improvements. Accessibility to transit from either side. Transit route across US 29 near Hollymead, so more direct access to local transit stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Framework 1</td>
<td>Framework 2</td>
<td>Framework 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?</td>
<td>Southern part—like center distribution</td>
<td>Northern part—like Uptown center, but should be smaller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compact development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mix of uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walkable pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a change in the boundary if it helped obtain an essential part of the road network?</td>
<td>Don’t like constant development</td>
<td>Some prefer tradeoff—better than const. in Framework 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners’ associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?</td>
<td>Walking and biking: yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads: no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Post-lunch discussion**

*Open Spaces*

- More accessible and desirable green spaces (not just along creeks)
- Make sure they [the green spaces] are interconnected
- Trailheads
- Mix of types with rural/natural and more structured/programmed
- More dog-friendly areas
- Lights? Security issues on trails – call boxes?
- Some [open spaces] could close at dark for parks but not really for trails.
Trail marker numbers for locating purposes

[Open spaces] could be groupings—not necessarily throughout the entire development

Who maintains the trails?

What kind of patrolling is done? Where would the police stations be?

Be aware of light pollution

Street Design and Parallel Networks

Liked the swales

Biofiltration

Like the green buffers along roads

Don’t like the parallel roads. Difficult at intersections

If parallel access roads are used, eliminate parallel parking and extend sidewalks for cafes, etc. Have alleyways for parking in back. It would make sidewalks safer to walk on especially on US 29.

Housing

Affordable housing very important: includes jobs that pay enough to afford to live here

Why does affordable have to look “affordable?” Can’t they be as nice as expensive ones but just smaller?

More choices in housing product and size. Quality construction.

Without regulating prices, how can you provide affordable housing in a place that is so desirable?

Salaries here don’t match the housing market

Not enough quality major employers (non-retail) e.g. research companies, etc.
Group 8

Framework 1

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - High degree of connectivity not achieved with intense US 29 improvements (vs. parallel connectors)
   - Not dense enough

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?
   - No real attention to [area from?] South Fork to Hollymead
   - Too concentrated on US 29
   - Not enough Neighborhood [Service] Centers

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
   - Good—employment near airport
   - Limited mixed use
   - Not enough opportunities for neighborhood shops and restaurants

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?
   - Lacks parallel roads

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
   - No! It does not address existing local needs
   - Same old, same old—South Fork to Hollymead. If one lane is dedicated to buses, we’d still be jammed.
   - Too reliant on US 29

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.
   - Area off Rio Mills Road is neglected
   - Walking/cycling routes to schools not achieved. Need more smaller connections between residential and schools.
   - Regional cycling connections not present—major motor vehicle route along US 29 not desirable for biking
Framework 2

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - Better transportation connections alternatives to US 29

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward roads parallel to US 29). Note that Alternative 2 features a “Midtown.”
   - 2nd Midtown [Uptown] farther north
   - Airport area good [for] employment
   - Restaurants and small retails closer to employment in UVA research park and near airport

Consensus Items:
   - Southern Midtown revitalization desirable; crucial to vision
   - Mixed use in south is good

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
   - Make residential near Airport Road mixed use
   - Like moving residential development from airport to US 29: higher density and mixed use there
   - If area along Rio Mills Road developed, keep US 29 buffer of green [Map Comment]
   - Keep striped area near Dickerson Road in rural land use designation [Map Comment]

Consensus Items:
   - More mixed use in Airport’s industrial park? [Map Comment]
   - Neighborhood 1 circled, with Midtown, from Hydraulic to Rio

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—the parallel roads and cross connections?
   - 2nd bridge over South Fork is necessary
   - Northern Free State connector is a plus
   - Frontage street from Rio Road to South Fork should be added on east side
   - Addition of new connections within existing neighborhoods is desirable
   - US 29 should be widened to six lanes from Hollymead to South Fork
   - Why not incorporate transit on east side, but bus on west side desirable to service increased development there
   - There needs to be state legislation to change the way transportation projects are funded [Map Comment]
   - Parallel road between Woodbrook and US 29 [Map Comment]
Consensus Item:
- Northern Free State is great [Map Comment]

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
- Will bus route intensity on west side limit/conflict with cycling access?

Consensus Items:
- Good—transit to the airport
- Incorporate bike lanes and pedestrian paths in North Free State connector to Meadowcreek

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.

Framework 3
1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - NO COMMENTS PROVIDED

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (more clustered than in Alternative 2, focused on US 29 and roads between US 29 and parallel roads). Note that Alternative 2 features an “Uptown.”
Consensus Item:
- Like uptown center [Map Comment]

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
- Like mixed use at airport
- Increase mixed use at south end and have two mixed use centers
- Swap land from airport: add some to the area near the dam but leave enough near the river to create a destination park
- More mixed use and density where Midtown was in Framework 2 [Map Comment]
- Add area around Rio Mills Road to development are to help fund Berkmar [Map Comment]
- Park [with] boat launch off Rio Mills Road [Map Comment]

Consensus Item:
- Add Midtown from Framework 2 [Map Comment]

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—including the parallel road to serve development north of the South Fork of the Rivanna?
- Add Northern Free State Road
- Like extended Berkmar Drive
- Alternative Ruckersville Parkway as US 29 bypass [Map Comment]

Consensus Items:
- Need Free State Road [Map Comment]
- With Free State, this will dump traffic onto US 29 [Map Comment]
- Parallel road south of 29 near Woodbrook School

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
- Like keeping at least one bus line on US 29
- Better serves east side residents
- Make Berkmar very bike friendly

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.
- NO COMMENTS PROVIDED
Comparison of All Three Alternatives

Note: Consensus Items circled in the original Workbook are identified here by **bold** type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?</td>
<td>Does not solve problems</td>
<td>Like Midtown.</td>
<td>Like Uptown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage mixed use in all stages of buildout</td>
<td>More mixed use in research park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has most NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Want both</td>
<td>Want both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus on US 29 services east side and west side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid [bus] in dedicated lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Which multimodal road network will best support the Places29 Vision &amp; Guiding Principles?</td>
<td>Like connectivity of driving on FW2 [meaning unclear] Driving access</td>
<td>Good to have bus on US 29</td>
<td>Connected Berkmar is essential, better possibilities for biking--safer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Transportation choices:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► driving, biking riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>► transit and walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Efficient and accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?</td>
<td>Best in southern end</td>
<td></td>
<td>Best in northern end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Compact development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mix of uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Walkable pattern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a change in the boundary if it helped obtain an essential part of the road network?</td>
<td>Compromise swap of land near dam: Keep a portion on the north side of Rio Mills Road for open space, a destination park along Berkmar.</td>
<td>Create a park on the river with access for boats, potential for bike trail along river from dam all the way to Darden Towe/Pen Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by</td>
<td>Yes to pedestrians and bikes; No to cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Framework 1</td>
<td>Framework 2</td>
<td>Framework 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual homeowners’ associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phasing: 1st priority for southern midtown; 2nd priority is Uptown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Post-lunch discussion**

*[Topic unclear-likely: Street Design]*

- [Have] Dialogue with VDOT to incorporate the road types shown by Consultant into types accepted by VDOT
- Make sure the trees shown in the design [simulations?] are actually used
- Like separation of cars from bike and pedestrian
- Design roads to fit character of neighborhood and topography of land
Implementation

- Development community needs to offer more financial support to deal with the impact of new development
- Have infrastructure in place or phased prior to commercial/residential development
- Density supports transit
**Group 10**

**Framework 1**

1. *How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?*
   - Who knows? Guess so. It would help to distill/simplify principles
   - Framework #1 meets the Vision and Guiding Principles the least of the three
   - Framework 1 better than Frameworks 2 and 3, especially with respect to the amount of growth, residential, employment, compactness

2. *What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward US 29)?*
   - If you spread them out a little like in [Frameworks] 2 and 3 it will spread out traffic better. Focusing at Hollymead and near 250 [Bypass] funnels everyone to focused areas creating gridlock (2)
   - Absence of Uptown and Midtown centers better than [Frameworks] 2 and 3
   - Absence of Midtown or Uptown can keep focus on Charlottesville downtown, which is major asset and draw for city and city residents. Don’t diminish the gems we have now

3. *What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?*
   - Not great but better than 2 or 3. Provides for less growth
   - Still too much retail, employment, residential
   - Need enough residential development that’s affordable

4. *What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements on US 29?*
   - Duplicate bus routes: if each [route] on 30 minute headway could be offset [by] 15 minutes to create a frequent transit overlap area
   - Major problem with US 29 N is no major “exit” to disperse US 29 traffic

**Consensus Item**

- Not enough parallel road development to meet existing development, much less future development (3)

5. *Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?*
   - No. No place to put walking/biking paths if no parallel road development

6. *Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.*
Unrealistic to think development can be limited to what’s shown in Framework 1, so plan for it (2)
Still does not create adequate green/open space parks on County line. Squares are great but still do not address [open space] need
Hollymead has a very poor and confusing internal road network [Map Comment]
Need better design (lack of trees) [Map Comment]

Framework 2

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - Fits better than [Framework] #1 but might be too much development (2)
   - Too much growth/development. Do we need more retail/employment?
   - Combination of [Frameworks] #2 and #3 is best

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (oriented toward roads parallel to US 29). Note that Alternative 2 features a “Midtown.”
   - Make sure centers have room for non-retail employment: services, software, tech, government, etc.
   - Ensure centers don’t get built/revamped without assurance of connector roads
   - Ensure coordination with downtown amenities so as not to “kill” downtown [Charlottesville]
   - Reuse Albemarle Square
   - Make sure it doesn’t kill downtown [Charlottesville] and accelerates sprawl into green [areas]
   - Prefer heavy development further south. Midtown preferred over Uptown

Consensus Item:
- Revitalization of existing centers is preferred to them becoming ghost towns (2)

3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
   - I like the centers pulled back from US 29 a bit
   - Maybe just too many centers
   - Midtown maybe OK; Uptown: no
   - Like the idea of Uptown
   - Residential and commercial should be located near major employment to minimize traffic on US 29
   - Redevelopment preferable to new development (2)

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—the parallel roads and cross connections?
   - Agree with adding parallel roads
Plenty of parallel roads – alternative roads in the plan
Parallel roads, no centers. Why are parallel roads coupled with centers?
Need feeder bus circulation from Forest Lakes to Hollymead Town Center

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
   - Hard to see walk and bike trails on map
   - Put plenty so have access between centers and between residential/mixed use areas and centers

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.
   - Density should be increased around major employers such as UVA research park and NGIC. Expansion at NGIC merits mixed use around facility therefore limiting traffic further south on US 29
   - Even though more development, no more green/open space. Squares don’t count
   - Will this all really happen as described? Virginia does not allow requiring phased development, adequate public facilities. We could get growth without roads and infrastructure
   - Cost?
   - Would the Destination Center in North Pointe mean a complete revision of the North Pointe plan? [Map Comment]

Framework 3

1. How well does this alternative address the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?
   - Too much residential, employment growth promotes sprawl, not consistent with compact development, density too high
   - I like [Framework] #3 best with enough parallel roads and focused development
   - Residential and employment growth ensures a prosperous County for all citizens to enjoy!

2. What do you think about the location and types of the Centers (more clustered than in Alternative 2, focused on US 29 and roads between US 29 and parallel roads). Note that Alternative 2 features an “Uptown.”
   - Prefer these [center] locations though the more spread out style in Framework 2
   - Do not prefer/ bizarre in terms of promoting compact development
   - Same concerns as to coordination with and impact to downtown as in Framework 2
   - Uptown in north with downtown mall in south seems nice with big destinations at each end
   - I like fewer centers with more focused development
3. What do you think about the location of residential, employment and mixed uses?
   - Too much employment
   - Mixed use is great if it really happens. Pantops is mixed use—ugh.
   - Does not examine regional impacts
   - s/b less (Framework #2 also) but realistically more than Framework #1
   - With 1,500 to 2,000 residents coming in each year need to maintain enough development to keep unemployment low (2)

4. What do you think of the proposed major transportation improvements—including the parallel road to serve development north of the South Fork of the Rivanna?
   - Since we do not have a bypass, the completion of Berkmar Drive is a major requirement to alleviate traffic on US 29
   - Circulate bus among Hollymead Town Center, North Pointe, Airport, Forest Lakes, North Fork residential will be useful
   - Need Northern Free State Road for access north that’s not on US 29
   - Like extension of connector road to north
   - Make sure you build connector roads if you build new centers
   - Absent the Berkmar extension road, this plan is unacceptable [Map Comment]
   - Without North State Road, this plan is not acceptable (2) [Map Comment]

5. Would the network of multimodal streets and trails proposed in this alternative serve your needs?
   - Yes. Prefer the Berkmar extension (2)

Consensus Item:
   - Still want to be able to walk/bike—need to see on map (2)

6. Please share your comments on any other features of this alternative that are not covered in the questions above.
   - Still no new significant green/open space. Squares are great but not really open space.
   - Prefer lesser amount of retail in Framework #2
   - Generally, want less resident/retail/employment than shown in Frameworks 2 and 3 but realize Framework 1 isn’t enough
Comparison of All Three Alternatives

Note: Consensus Items circled in the original Workbook are identified here by **bold** type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which alternative offers the best distribution of Centers in terms of size and location?</td>
<td>Best of a poor set of choices with respect to amount of growth. Density. Compact.</td>
<td>Ensure redevelopment is emphasized where possible. Redevelopment before development.</td>
<td>Uptown on one end and downtown on other end and Berkmar and Free State Road give figure 8 pattern of traffic. Having Uptown at the northern end of the county makes sense. Residential and commercial development near connector roads will help traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would you like to see either the Midtown or Uptown included in the Preferred Alternative?</td>
<td>Add Uptown to Framework 1 level of development?</td>
<td>Both—add Uptown to this framework. Maybe.</td>
<td>Yes-to distribute growth along US 29 and not be end to end development. Both-add Midtown to this. No, encourages growth. Yes, provided polar [?] end destination to downtown mall. If we do not grow we die!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which major transit routing works best? Why do you think so?</td>
<td>Needs parallel connector roads</td>
<td>Need Berkmar extension and Free State Road to Polo Grounds Road from Framework 2 North Free State provides essential corridor into downtown Charlottesville—must be easy to access downtown for all the residents. Berkmar and Free State.</td>
<td>Framework 3 works best but better of Northern Free State on east side of 29 which gives alternate route into town on east. Transit on separate corridors will allow adjustments to be made to serve various areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 4
Which multimodal road network will best support the Places29 Vision & Guiding Principles?

Consider:
- Transportation choices: driving, biking, riding transit, and walking
- Efficient and accessible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need to have roads and development implemented at the same time</td>
<td>Either [Frameworks] 2 or 3</td>
<td>Need walk/bike access to bus/transit stop and centers residential areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 5
Which group of Centers and land uses will best support the Places29 Vision and Guiding Principles?

Consider:
- Compact development
- Mix of uses
- Walkable pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most compact especially with redevelopment</td>
<td>Hard to comment on bike/pedestrian use with current maps. Need to ensure these exist and are connected.</td>
<td>Mixed use is preferred; we need more affordable housing near employment bases. Excessive rules and regulations increase costs beyond affordable range. Need mixed use with walkable pattern so residents can opt not to drive and those without cars can use it. Compact development does this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 6
Alternatives 2 and 3 each show a change in the boundary between the Development Areas and Rural Areas. Would you support a change in the boundary if it helped obtain an essential part of the road network?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Development should occur around road network to preserve rural areas. Need to guarantee roads will be built before centers are created. Prefer Framework 3 boundary change that leaves some open space along South Fork. (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 7
All three alternatives show an extensive open space network. Some pieces of the network may need to use areas owned by individual homeowners' associations (HOA), in order to connect to nearby centers. Does this approach make sense if the HOAs agree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework 1</th>
<th>Framework 2</th>
<th>Framework 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but disagree—none add to the open space in any significant way. Squares fine, county line park good but not enough.</td>
<td>Yes. Shows co-operation in communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question 8
Now that you have compared the alternatives in various ways, please go back through the questions in Part 4 and circle the **Lower growth/employment.**
Question | Framework 1 | Framework 2 | Framework 3
--- | --- | --- | ---
parts of your responses you would most like to see in the preferred alternative. | | | |

**Post-lunch discussion**

**Open Space**

- Avoid clear cutting—retain trees (as was done with Hollymead)
- Avoid scalping soil and surface vegetation (as was done with Hollymead)
- Move affirmatively to create/retain open space, not relying only on non-buildable areas to be open
- Incorporate parks in residential areas, even if only a pocket park
- Use landscaping that attracts wildlife
- Dog parks would be nice

**Housing**

- Need housing for working people (service industry, tradesmen, etc. not just “blue collar, teachers, fire fighters, cops)
- Don’t “Aspenize” Charlottesville
- Reduce rules and regulations to facilitate affordable housing

**Implementation**

- How are private developers influenced to follow these plans vs. going their own way?
- How much will projects like Berkmar extension cost?
- Timeline to implement?
- Who pays for it?
- Capacity of city planning staff to address Places29?

**Infrastructure**

- Time lights along US 29 to reduce stops for through traffic
- Improve major intersections to allow more than 3-4 cars before [traffic light] turns yellow (e.g. Rio Road and Hydraulic Road crossing US 29)
- Good: use grades to allow pedestrians and cyclists to cross under US 29
- Where possible, pull turning traffic off main road