



Creating and
Connecting
Communities
in Northern Albemarle

Places29 – Workshop #3 Sketch Framework Concepts

November 3rd, 2005
6:30 PM to 9:30 PM

Sutherland Middle School Cafeteria

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 November 3, 2005. Comments and other input were taken from each table's comment sheets and annotations made on the Sketch Framework Concept maps.

The summary is organized by table-number (there were 12 tables). The first part of each table summary is divided into three subsections, one for each of the Sketch Framework Concept alternatives (A, B, and C). It reflects the small group's comments with respect to the following three questions and as noted by the table's Recorder:

- 1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*
- 2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*
- 3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

Some participants posted (additional) comments directly on the different framework concept maps. These have been "collated" into the listing of comments under the three questions above to the extent possible. Map comments that could not clearly be associated with one of the questions are listed at the end of the summary for each of the alternatives. It should be noted that it is assumed (but not known) that the comments noted on the Recorders' sheets are the result of some group discussion. It is also assumed that the notes and annotations found on the maps are more reflective of an individual's perspective rather than that of the group.

The second part of each table summary reflects the group's input on the second set of questions (comparison of alternatives) posed by the Facilitators:

1. *In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?*
2. *Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?*
3. *Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?*

Any comments by the preparers of this summary are shown in [square brackets]. Also, in cases where public comments were based on factual errors or misunderstandings, these are clarified – to the extent possible – through commentaries in brackets and/or deletions of portions of a public comment (indicated by strikethrough).

COMMENTS ON SKETCH FRAMEWORK CONCEPTS

Group 1

Alternative A

1. *What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Northern Free State Road connection (intersection at Rio); funding
- Berkmar Extension [not crossing the South Fork] – less through traffic avoiding bypass – lack of bypass
- Minimal impact on existing neighborhoods
- Grade separations and interchanges [comment was made regarding Alternative B which does not focus on these elements, so comment moved here to Alternative A which does focus on them].
- Widening US 29 [Original comment “Failure to widen US 29” was included under question #2 and comment “More lanes on US 29 if Northern Free State Road connects to Polo Grounds Road” was included under question #3, participants did not understand that US 29 is widened in this alternative, so comment moved to this section and reworded]
- More dense, “downtown-mall like” hubs with light rail connection between them would be good [Comment taken from Map]

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Forest Lakes through traffic [there are no changes to roads in Forest Lakes in this Alternative]
- Northern Free State bypass, should dev. Sections because of traffic at Polo Grounds Road [somewhat unclear what commenter is asking for]
- No western bypass with interchanges

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- Interchanges on bypass [there is no bypass in this alternative]
- Berkmar Drive connection across Rio Road [Berkmar Drive does connect across Rio Road, unclear if comment is related to desire for a grade separation]

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Extending Berkmar Drive [across South Fork of Rivanna River]
- Densification of existing areas
- Airport “Downtown” preferred [vs. one at the Rio Road intersection] because of existing separation between airport and city
- Density supported by connecting transit systems – roads or light rail
- “Downtowns” (especially near airport)
- Hub concept
- Avoiding of bypass
- Not disrupting original neighborhoods
- ~~Grade separations/interchanges~~ [grade separations are not a primary aspect of this Alternative, comment moved to Alternative A]
- Extension of Cedar Hill Drive [Cedar Hill Road to connect with Berkmar Drive]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Large emp. [employment] in Berkmar – loss of quiet in existing neighborhoods [this may be referring to Alternative A’s land use pattern]
- Interconnection of neighborhoods because of traffic load and speed
- Increase of traffic on Earlysville Road without expanding road itself [unclear why there is belief that traffic on Earlysville Road will increase, road is highlighted on map because it is an existing connecting road not because the Alternative includes improvements]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Widen Earlysville beyond the airport
- [Controlling] Speeds on parallel roads

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Southern parkway [Assume this means the eastern parkway since North is to the right in these maps.]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Parking deck [meaning unclear]
- Parkways – any parkways ([with] limited access parallel to US 29)
- Parkways in rural areas – [serve] no purpose
- Bypasses (suck life out of US 29), decrease vitality of corridor
- Dependency on large employers (or even inclusion of large employers)

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Extension of Sam's Club/Wal-Mart through road [Berkmar Drive]
- Eliminate the parkways

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- A combination of A and B – not C.
- Berkmar further extended.
- Hubs (“Downtown” at airport)

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Walking distance – sidewalks, crossroads, walking bridge across US 29 at Rio Road
- Rapid transit between hubs
- Studies on roads, bypass.

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- Where will the funding for improvements come from?

Group 2

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Meadowcreek Parkway
- Short overpasses over US 29 rather than traffic lights or any similar options as connection alternatives to roads [this comment moved from Question #3, as group did not understand that this Alternative includes interchanges and/or overpasses]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Does not include Berkmar Drive crossing [across South Fork of Rivanna River]
- Concern for maintenance of greenways against US 29 (as opposed to increasing lanes and/or development)
- Concern for maintenance of existing scenery

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- More green areas/landscaping
- Increase consideration of transit center options (loop) rather than parkways
- BRT spine down US 29 (with feeders)
- More attention to alternative [parallel] roads, less attention to US 29 expansions
- More attention to alternatives and density considerations
- Perhaps include a spine with feeders [transit] on US 29

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Berkmar Drive connections
- Downtown concepts
- Parallel roads (NOT through neighborhoods)...more?
- Downtown center below Rio [Road] more economically feasible...now, but needs multimodal transportation connections to be appealing

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Development by Hollymead out of scale for walkability – too many hard surfaces
- No more stop lights – consider alternatives for crossings over US 29
- No alternative transit offered (rail, BRT)
- Lack of interconnection between green spaces
- Too much density northeast of Proffit Road
- Too dense here [North Pointe area] [comment written on drawing]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- More emphasis on southern center density
- Consider more walkability in northern ~~density~~ [Development] areas

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Eastern parkway

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Too much high-density development [comment would likely be applicable to Alternative B as well]
- Alternate parkways too far away from development (pressure on growth boundary, especially with eastern of the two parkway alternatives)
- Berkmar Drive connection is closer to US 29 and therefore more important
- Too much focus on building roads (overarching criticism)
- Ruckersville Parkway south of Polo grounds [Ruckersville Parkway is on the west side of US 29, while Polo Grounds Road is on the east side of US 29. Uncertain what this comment means.]
- Eastern connection too far away, too rural

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Maintain growth boundaries and concentrate growth towards Charlottesville. And, give alternative ways to get there (i.e. not by car)

- More greenery in development areas
- Too dense throughout [comment written on drawing]
- Not enough light green [public open space] [comment written on drawing]
- More light density, less heavy density [comment written on drawing]

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- Alternative B
- Higher density along US 29 for alternate transit options (BRT)

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Need alternative transit options, no more pavement
- More green space

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- Want to see more about what development would look like – setbacks, scale, landscaping
- Options to high density – need to see a range

Other General Comments

- Southern “downtown”
- Alternates to roads – too narrow focus on options
- Parkways
- Berkmar Drive extension
- More greenery

Group 3

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Too much traffic for one corridor
- Divides east and west

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- “Downtown” areas
- Walkable shopping areas
- Could take traffic off US 29 because there are more businesses to serve Forest Lakes and Hollymead

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- May not solve traffic problem on Hwy 29
- Too many connections to Pritchett Lane in North Pointe area

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Make the traffic connectors (loops) in the Rio Road/US 29 area multimodal – not just for cars

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- Pedestrian sidewalks, bike path down Proffit Road; widen [Route] 20 and connect to Burley Station Road through Gilbert [Heights]
- More central green space
- Too many connections to Pineridge Road

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Getting traffic off US 29

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Deeper loop – needs to connect to Route 20 Eastern Ext. Bypass
- Does not get trucks off US 29
- [New road indicated through Albemarle Place] may encourage people cutting through with cars and reduce pedestrian friendly multiuse [comment written on drawing]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Bypass farther away from US 29; no need to widen US 29 between Rio Road and Hollymead with parallel roads

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- “Downtown” concepts

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Need outside loops to get through traffic totally off US 29 corridor – but it is costly

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

Other General Comments

- Pedestrian crossings over US 29 are not possible; interconnectivity has already been made difficult
- Need ways to get through neighborhoods (Forest Lakes) to centers along US 29 without getting into a vehicle

Group 4

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Berkmar Drive extended [and suggested] crossways

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Lots of people take Earlysville Road to GE Fanuc, using Airport Road and US 29 [this comment is related to existing conditions that this Alternative does not change]
- With sidewalk/bike lanes, how will seniors move because 50% of Rio District is senior

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Airport Acres Road (drainage issues); Concern of drainage and water contamination in Airport Acres neighborhood where residents have wells [this comment was a note on drawing]
- Grade-separated interchanges for Hydraulic, Rio, and Greenbrier [these are intended to be part of this Alternative]
- Want grade-separated intersections between Hydraulic and Rio Roads [these are intended to be part of this Alternative]
- If section of Dickerson Road with gravel surface were paved and improved it would be helpful [this was both a comment written on drawings and made by the recorder on the note pad]
- Buy land for parks near Indian lands on river by US 29. Bridge construction might compromise historical meaning

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- Bring out-of-town drivers close to residences at south end of Earlysville Road
- How are seniors going to move?
- Indian Mounds [at South Fork of Rivanna River] – create green space

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Alternative Berkmar Drive crossing (parallel roads)
- Likes Berkmar Drive alternative route [note on drawing]
- Likes close-in parallel roads like Berkmar Drive north of Market St. in Hollymead Towncenter, are close to people's jobs/residences/stores [note on drawing]
- Likes “downtown” because it starts anew and nothing is destroyed
- Likes mixed use around Airport Acres neighborhood – if reasonable easement and aesthetics are provided
- Likes mixed use area around Airport Acres neighborhood – if has reasonable easements and aesthetics [note on drawing]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Keep green space (north of South Fork of Rivanna River in rural areas) [this was recorded as a response to Question #1, but is really a response to Question #2, as the Alternative includes development in the area north of the South Fork]
- Interconnections with Forest Lake South
- Why are there where potential roads through neighborhoods in Option B? More cut through traffic? [note on drawing]
- North of [Airport] Rd. downtown will take too long
- “Downtown” at Rio Road destroys existing areas
- Already have Hollymead Town Center – NO NEED for more expansion. There is already empty retail space
- Already have small businesses with Food Lion/Forest Lakes, restaurants, etc. - why do we need more? [note on drawing]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Want Rights of Way of roads planned prior to construction (officially dedicated)
- If Hollymead Town Center needs to start today, consider how long Target took
- Use already vacant offices and enhance that instead of opening up new commercial areas; there is already Hollymead Professional Center with vacancy – why bring more? [note on drawing]
- Maintain green space in new development
- Maintain green space inside of designated growth areas [note on drawing]

- Keep lots of green space when rural areas north of the river are developed [note on drawing]
- What about transit?

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Berkmar Drive extended
- Likes parallel roads taking traffic off U29 [note on drawing]
- Maintain commercial along US 29
- Mixed use better than large retail centers
- Likes mixed use areas rather than large retail [note on drawing]
- “Albemarle Downtown” – a good idea
- Likes Earlysville and Dickerson Road alternative roads [note on drawing in conflict with statement regarding unanimously against Ruckersville Parkway, below]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Interconnections
- Concern with potential roads through Forest Lakes South – cut through traffic through existing neighborhoods [note on drawing]
- Ruckersville Parkway: width of ROW; houses lost; property values going down; 150-188 ft ROW; 35 mph while 60 on 29 [this comment was made in regards to Alternative A which does not include Ruckersville Parkway, so comment moved here]
- Proposed Ruckersville Parkway between Dickerson Road and Earlysville Road is too expensive; dangerous; limited access (not a good idea); access to two-lane road too limited
- Windsor Estates – what would happen to private homes if Earlysville Road is widened? [this comment was made in regards to Alternative A which does not include Ruckersville Parkway, so comment moved here – also this was note on drawing]
- Do not like mixed use and density
- Does not like mixed use, dense population, multilevel buildings [note on drawing]
- Could green space be adjacent to Airport Acres Neighborhood rather than in the middle of retail/mixed use? [note on drawing]
- Unanimously against Ruckersville Parkway!!!

- Ruckersville Parkway – sounds ridiculous so far, no concrete space, if limited access need service roads. Way too expensive compared to other suggested changes, and is too disrupting [this comment was made in regards to Alternative A which does not include Ruckersville Parkway, so comment moved here – also this was note on drawing]
- Proposed Ruckersville Parkway - 150 ft Right of Way is impossible unless lots of houses are destroyed [This comment was note on drawing and made in regards to Alternative A which does not include Ruckersville Parkway, so moved here]
- Ruckersville Parkway – negative! 150 feet Right of Way – why? How many houses will be lost? Properly values of Windsor Rivanna will be greatly reduced, who wants to ride on a road at 35 mph when you can ride 60 mph on US 29? [This comment was note on drawing and made in regards to Alternative A which does not include Ruckersville Parkway, so moved here]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Widen Earlysville Road – cost effective
- Widen Earlysville Road, extend Berkmar Drive, do not build Ruckersville Parkway; much more cost effective to widen Earlysville Road than to build Ruckersville Parkway or two limited access, two-lane parkways; Berkmar Drive extended is better by far; do not move focus to Ruckersville Parkway. [note on drawing]
- Build Berkmar Drive extended – no need for loop on Earlysville Road [was a response to Question #1, but moved here because really a response to this question]
- Build Berkmar Drive extension to avoid traveling on US 29 at all!
- Bridge between Berkmar Drive extension and South Fork of Rivanna River [was a response to Question #2, but moved here because really a response to this question]
- Transit is very important
- Buy land for parks (where Indian mounds are located between river and Berkmar Drive extension) in location where bridge is planned (between Berkmar Drive extension and South Fork of Rivanna River)
- Green space north of river - county should buy space for a park [note on drawing]

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- Connections in B
- Berkmar Drive connections
- Parallel roads [parkways] in C [this seems to be in conflict with comments made specifically related to Alternative C]

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Enhance the use of transit - preplanned

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

Group 5

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Pedestrian crossings (from east to west of US 29)
- Open space north of Polo Grounds Road
- Roads parallel to US 29, other than a bypass

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Extend Berkmar Drive and pave Rio Mills Road

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Parallel roads to US 29

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- No more roundabouts
- No “downtown” near airport
- No downtowns – green space instead

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Extend Meadowcreek Parkway north past development area
- Add roundabouts in place of intersections
- Land swap (see map note [below])

- Need land swap: rural versus commercial – for building Berkmar Drive extension through rural area reclaim equal amount of land back to rural from Development Areas to make up for taking rural space for the road
- [Note on Map suggests roundabouts on Hillsdale Drive at Greenbrier Drive and at Glenwood Station]

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Public services in north development area
- Extend Meadowcreek Parkway north past development area [This was a comment made regarding a desired addition to Alternative B, so is also an element of Alternative C that is attractive]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Too much retail
- Too much traffic on Earlysville Road – leave it as it is

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Open space by airport
- Alternative transportation and station parking lots for passengers' vehicles

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- Berkmar Drive on concept plan B
- Extend Berkmar Drive across river
- Hillsdale Drive [Extended]
- Bypasses on B except for Earlysville Road [Assume the Alternative this relates to is C not B]

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future

framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Too much retail in all concepts
- Meadowcreek Parkway to Greene County line

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

Other General Comments

- Too much traffic on Earlysville Road
- No. 1 value: open space

Group 6

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Bike paths [Note: bike paths were not shown on the sketch framework map and the concept of adding bike path was not limited to Concept A]
- Build overpasses at intersections [note on drawing]
- Beautify US 29 with trees and shrubs, etc.), build plazas rather than strip mall-type development along US 29 [note on drawing]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Too much emphasis on US 29.
- No room for business parks.
- Maps do not show pedestrian paths

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- High speed transit
- Light rail was mentioned on all alternatives
- Build light rail down US 29 corridor [note on drawing]
- Mass transit system along US 29 – not dependent on stop lights, can run on a tight schedule; transportation funds should be invested in public transportation pedestrian paths/bike paths; moratorium on the construction of new shopping centers [note on drawing]
- Too much concentration of traffic on US 29; does not allow traffic to move non stop at 65 mph [note on drawing]
- Neighborhoods geared towards mass transit
- Buses are not neighborhood friendly
- Build a system of bike ways for transportation between residential/shopping/ school areas so people can travel between these areas safely without getting into a car [note on drawing]
- Keep open areas and landscape/parks [note on drawing]
- Large tracts of open space
- Maps do not show pedestrian paths

- Mixed use: Why not include industrial areas for employment and tax base? [note on drawing]
- Strip malls do not age well; let's bring in more than retail [note on drawing]
- Too much traffic on US 29; need parallel routes to US 29; need walkable shopping; [note on drawing]

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Berkmar Drive [Extended]
- B preferable to A; Berkmar Drive as parallel road – very good idea [note on drawing]
- Mixed use centers a benefit to keep traffic in neighborhood [note on drawing]
- B – best plan, more green space and connections between neighbors; a couple of other “downtown” areas around US 29 would make sense, but they need to be easily reachable in ways other than cars [note on drawing]
- B is better than A with greater emphasis on transit network off US 29 [note on drawing]
- Likes the idea of extending Berkmar but keeping it as a boulevard, less traffic, slower speed [note on drawing]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Provide parallel extended road east of US 29 like Berkmar Drive to the west
- Earlysville connection is not present
- No bike paths
- No transit
- No business parks
- No pedestrian paths
- No more shopping without market study
- Bypass is missing
- Keep development in current Development Areas
- Opposed to the construction of Meadow Creek Parkway [note on drawing]
- Extend Berkmar Drive to Ruckersville [note on drawing]
- Do not need another large downtown center; do not need another northern Virginia; if we have to have another mega center put it out towards UVA not Hollymead Towncenter [note on drawing]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Updated traffic study from the 2000 study on how much through traffic goes through Charlottesville/Northern Albemarle on US 29 (tractor trailers specifically)
- No through traffic for downtown
- If there must be a “downtown” concept then it must be pedestrian oriented!!! Set to walk!!!; [note on drawing]
- Make Berkmar Drive a limited access road for bypass [paraphrased from easel sheet]
- No plans for mass transit and no future planning for light industrial area – jobs! [note on drawing]
- No more shopping centers [note on drawing]
- Revitalize the present centers; upgrade what we have got before building new [note on drawing]
- Need more sidewalks and pedestrian bridges for safety; bike paths and walkways to Hollymead Towncenter [note on drawing]

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- Encourage pedestrian walkways all along the 29 corridor
- Berkmar extended to airport road is very desirable with a separate bikeway parallel to it; promote separate bikeways as much as possible so that safety concerns with bike lanes right next to car lanes will not be as much of an issue; biking for transportation has a great future for many obvious reasons – let’s plan to accommodate it
- Need to develop Earlysville Road to connect north back to Rio Road; Earlysville Road is overly traveled now and not adequate for traffic

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Ruckersville Parkway
- Parkway to the east of US 29

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Ruckersville Parkway
- Parkway to the east of US 29

- Ruckersville Parkway and Parkway to the east of US 29 do not have enough internal traffic – they destroy rural areas and open space
- Not sure what a bypass would resolve with respect to congestion on US 29 [note on drawing]
- Opposed to Ruckersville Parkway and the parkway east of US 29 – we need to preserve our rural areas, the parkways will encourage more sprawl [note on drawing]
- C acquires too much private rural property; destroys rural character; “limited access” does not always stay limited [note on drawing]
- There is already too much traffic on Route 743 [note on drawing]
- What about the property VDOT already purchased for a bypass? If VDOT needs to purchase new rural land through eminent domain that was a waste of taxpayers money [note on drawing]
- Opposed to Concept C – no Berkmar Drive extended, watershed issues, expensive property will need to be acquired for small amount of diverted traffic. Why not include Berkmar Drive extended in C instead of spending many millions on the Ruckersville Parkway or parkway east of US 29 in plan C. How about using those millions for light rail in the corridor to give people a serious, high speed alternative to cars; let’s not ruin our area with urban sprawl – Atlanta is no. 1, we are already no. 2; we need to preserve our parkways; let’s not destroy our land with ugly bypasses; the bypasses do not make sense for 12% of traffic [note on drawing]
- Concerned about development along bypasses; does not want development like that on US 29 in Ruckersville; the bypass may not solve the traffic issues of shopping along US 29. Bypasses would only be good for truck traffic cutting through. [note on drawing]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]
- Need high speed alternative with no lights, 65 mph – not addressed by any of the plans [note on Alternative C drawing]

- People living in this area selected it for rural/peaceful/low density [note on Alternative C drawing]

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]
- What percentage of large trucks on US 29 are through traffic? Would they be forced to use parkways? [note on Alternative C drawing]

Group 7

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- May encourage public transportation
- More money appears to be used for public transportation because of fewer new road projects

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Need to know the effect on private landowners – looks significant
- Will not work at all without additional transit – just more of the same
- Lack of useful alternatives to US 29
- Not enough park land

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- More public transportation/transit options
- What is the new existing green space?
- Need the Berkmar Drive extension

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Bridge on Berkmar Drive extended
- “Downtown” type centers farther out (i.e. North Pointe) make sense to do before those closer to the city
- Woodbrook neighborhood connections
- Limited parallel roads to US 29 are a good start

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Woodbrook neighborhood connections

- Meadowcreek Parkway should go farther
- Not enough park land on any of the plans

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- Create alternative parallel roads to US 29: 1) with centers 2) without centers
- For comparison: Greenbrier Drive as originally intended (Hydraulic to US 29) s/b built - “Rock Storey”) [An old development proposal that would have included a connection where Greenbrier veers to the north and stops now. Subsequently, the County approved subdivisions incompatible with this alignment. The “Rock Storey” reference is to the same development proposal.]
- Provide pedestrian bridge for shoppers to Fashion Mall [note on drawing]

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- This concept alternative is the best one – connected Berkmar Drive is excellent, likes the mixed use area idea, likes the UVA area being a “downtown center”, likes the parallel road idea, this will help the traffic flow the best; connect from Rock storey (Rio-Hydraulic) to Greenbrier

Alternative C

1. *What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Western parallel parkway design – not realistic
- Politically not possible because of Lynchburg travel
- By extending the western parallel parkway to Ruckersville, sprawl is encouraged
- Ruckersville Parkway encourages sprawl in Greene County [note on drawing]
- Seems to assume that no alternative transit will be used
- Does not like the idea of Ruckersville Parkway –is too drastic a change, not enough access to the existing community, too expensive, too many homes affected [note on drawing]
- Need a Berkmar Drive bridge; this [what is shown in Alternative C] does not help with the traffic from Lynchburg with larger trucks; just widen US 29 – use VDOT's [note on drawing]

- Northern Free State Road connector should not use Polo Grounds Road – instead it should continue on and connect up to Proffit Road but not beyond [note on drawing]
- Does not think that the proposed road on the west side of US 29, that uses Dickerson, solves the through-the-Charlottesville traffic [note on drawing]
- Widening of US 29 between Polo Grounds and Airport Road should not be done [note on drawing]
- We should not connect Woodbrook to other neighborhoods – keep it isolated [note on drawing]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Connect Berkmar Drive to Berkmar extended
- Transit should extend farther to include Greene County
- Eastern parallel parkway may be impossible due to historic resource in its path
- Why built the eastern parkway beyond Proffit? – will encourage sprawl
- Where is the transit option for buses or light rail between Greene County and Charlottesville, and a shuttle “circulator bus” to move people throughout Northern Community center/UVA research? [note on drawing]

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- The parkway concept does not encourage public transit; the cost of gas is so high we need public transit more than all these side roads than encourage more driving

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- Bridge for Berkmar Drive extended is essential
- “Downtown” center out near UVA Research Park is a good idea
- Neighborhood connectors

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Need more parks/green space
- Add a circulating shuttle in Hollymead, UVA Research Park area
- Connect residents and jobs/retail

- Where is the transit option for buses or light rail between Greene County and Charlottesville, and a shuttle “circulator bus” to move people throughout Northern Community center/UVA research? [note on drawing for Alternative C]

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- How do we connect areas East-West of US 29 for pedestrians?
- Please show difference between existing green/open space/parkland and new; specifics on transit options for each presented alternative [note on drawing for Alternative A]
- Likes the idea of more public transportation, that money could be used for more public transportation, need to know more about transit [note on drawing for Alternative A]
- Maps do not show the correct land use in North Pointe area– i.e. with Great Eastern Management Co. development [note on drawing for Alternative A]
- Information needed that explains how much private land is affected by each plan – that is an essential concern; need to know for each proposed road the number of private homeowners affected – those whose lawn is directly in the path of or serves as throughway and how such throughway is obtained (purchase or eminent domain) [note on drawing for Alternative A]

Group 8

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Parallel roads – get traffic off US 29
- Possibility of more public transportation
- Increase access and connectivity
- Widening
- Potential increase in access of US 29 for pedestrians
- Opportunity for the increase and efficiency of bike paths

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Traffic
- Interruption of neighborhoods and people's properties
- Bike paths go unused

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- [No Comments]

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- Suggestion to add area south of Hydraulic Road and west of US 29 to the project area

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Network of smaller, more frequent connecting roads
- “Downtowns” at Rio Road and in northern area
- True parallel road
- Connection between Hollymead and Dickerson Road
- Longer connections

- Wal-Mart and North Berkmar Drive continuing
- Bike lanes on Berkmar Drive
- Good [new road between Polo Grounds Road and US 29] [note on drawing]

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Southern end of Berkmar Drive extended (western parallel road)
- There might be difficulty in marketing residential part of northern “downtown”
- Might be resistance to [concepts of Alternative] south of Rio Road
- Concern regarding [potential] cut-through traffic [in area south of Rio Road West] related to [concept of Berkmar Drive extended] [note on drawing]
- Uncertainty about a new downtown – is it possible?
- Is Albemarle Place already a downtown?
- Is it pedestrian friendly?
- Absence of free/open space

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- [No comments]

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- Suggestion to add area south of Hydraulic Road and west of US 29 to the project area [additional note suggests provision of bypass for this area outside of the study area]

Alternative C

1. *What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Would divert traffic from neighborhood to I-250
- Civic [District]– future park (A, B, and C) [at site of Baker-Butler Elementary School]

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Bringing traffic into residential areas
- Lack of connection to Pantops, UVA, and downtown (A, B, and C)

- Ruckersville Parkway
- Parkway east of US 29 – diverts attention and resources away from US 29

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- COST comparison between this and Western Parkway

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- Future Frank Peregoy [spelling?] Park [note on drawing at site of Baker-Butler Elementary School]

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. *In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?*

- Support for B over A [and assume over C]

2. *Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?*

- Pedestrian traffic
- Public transportation on US 29 (Alternative A) – want it to be more efficient
- Some think that a western bypass is a good idea while others oppose
- Wants plan to be pedestrian friendly
- Human scale

3. *Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?*

- Will people really want to live near airport? Is that plausible?
- Will noise of Northern “Downtown” impact residential areas?
- Address concern of dumping southern end [assume that this refers to the southern end of Commonwealth Drive] into neighborhoods

Group 9

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Might bring services closer to where people live
- Grade-separated interchanges would be beneficial
- Makes rapid transit more concise/possible
- Providing parallel roads will make emergency services move more smoothly

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Hillsdale Drive extension is seen as a cut through road with no destination – just a way of avoiding traffic on US 29
- Will not be successful if the local movement/town center concept does not work
- Condensing development along US 29
- Concern about the ability for emergency services to move through the community along US 29

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- More parks/green space
- Predicted number of people in the town centers
- How much green space will be included in town centers?
- Distance between schools/parks, etc.
- Northern areas need more parks
- Grade separated interchanges – are a good thing
- US 29 improvement details
- Character of connecting roads?
- Need analysis of view sheds
- Consider roundabouts – traffic keeps moving but more slowly
- Make connectivity between existing roads (pedestrians/bikes-vehicular) in new development

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- More feasible in terms of regulations/economics
- Connections from Rio Road to the airport without getting onto US 29
- Better access for emergency vehicles
- The vehicular interconnectivity in the new development
- The two more condensed town centers are positive
- “The airport center” looks good – grid most conducive to making a good downtown
- Town center at Rio Road and US 29 – natural because of residential concentration

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Connections from existing residential areas to existing commercial areas create concerns about safety on residential streets – also, residential to residential connections change the character of existing residential neighborhoods
- The town center at Rio Road and US 29 will simply create more congestion
- [mark on drawing: strike out of new street connection between Woodbrook neighborhood and condo development to the south]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Proposed connection between residential neighborhoods should be for pedestrians and bikes – not cars
- Vehicular connectivity makes sense for new development – interconnectivity between existing areas should be for pedestrian and bikes
- Pedestrian connections between residential neighborhoods and schools
- More parks, green space, and community centers

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Town centers – good because they support the possibility of transit [downtowns were shown on Alternative B]
- Parkway east of US 29 – good because lessens traffic on US 29

- Parkway east of US 29 is OK but encourages sprawl and detracts from the growth areas

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Ruckersville Parkway will not stay 35 mph
- Ruckersville Parkway does not recognize “natural” travel patterns
- Concerns about the proximity of the Ruckersville Parkway to residences
- Two parkways are too expensive and not helpful – politically unpopular
- Environmental community is concerned about the Ruckersville Parkway
- [mark on drawing: strike out of new street connection between Woodbrook neighborhood and condo development to the south]
- Bad idea [note on drawing regarding parkway west of US 29]
- Too expensive, bad for environment [note on drawing at eastern parkway section south of Polo Grounds Road]

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- Add transit
- Change vehicular interconnectivity from vehicular to pedestrian/bike when existing areas are involved
- More parks/green space

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. *In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?*

- [No comments]

2. *Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?*

- [No comments]

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- [No comments]

Group 10

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Berkmar Drive north of the South Fork of the Rivanna River
- Meadowcreek Parkway tying into Polo Grounds Road

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- No crossing of river for Berkmar Drive
- Still uses US 29 for too much of the traffic
- Choke point at US 29 and Berkmar Drive/Polo Grounds Road

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Berkmar Drive should cross the South Fork of the Rivanna River
- Lanes on US 29 – go to four lanes and back to eight lanes

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- River crossing of Berkmar Drive
- Northern downtown center ties UVA Research Park with Hollymead Towncenter.

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Southern “downtown” center (existing development is too expensive to redesign)
- Downtown centers compete with Charlottesville – counterproductive

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Extend Meadowcreek Parkway [Northern Free State Road] north beyond Polo Grounds Road

Alternative C

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Northern extension of Meadowcreek Parkway (but wondered about development along it – not confident about “limited access”)

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Ruckersville Parkway
- Disconnect between transit and neighborhood plans
- Mixed use
- Isolated employment center to Northeast in Piney Mountain area

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Connect Berkmar Drive across river
- Tie Earlysville Road to Berkmar Drive rather than a parkway
- Keep northern portion of Ruckersville Parkway but tie into Berkmar Drive at airport
- Bike lanes on Earlysville – flatten and straighten
- Likes transportation as modified but development plan on “B”

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- [marks on drawing indicate elimination of portions of the Ruckersville Parkway – between airport and Earlysville Road in favor of a Berkmar Drive extended with bridge across river]

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- Alternative C’s transportation with development concepts of B, but without “downtowns”

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Missing green space preservation (not as much as last time [Crozet?]) - seems to just be residual
- Buffers
- Storm water concerns

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- Coordination with Greene County. What are their plans?
- It would be useful to compare the three alternatives, to expose which (or mixture) would maximize population growth; minimize construction of roads and minimize construction of non-roads at Carleton Road [comment written on drawing of Alternative A]

Group 11

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Rural area north of the South Fork of the Rivanna River stays protected
- Building blocks with a tighter grid

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Bottleneck on US 29 at the South Fork of the Rivanna River [also noted on drawing]
- Short sighted in terms of connectivity
- Large roads not connected to places of dense population

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Keep US 29 as the place for through traffic

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Makes better sense
- Extension of growth area makes sense
- Maintains US 29 as an artery
- Nice core grid

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Possible citizen resistance at Carrsbrook [likely misunderstanding regarding roads that are highlighted, highlight only indicates that they currently connect, not that improvements would be made to encourage more through traffic]
- No indications of demography
- Lacks Berkmar Drive crossing at the South Fork of the Rivanna River
- How do you contain the growth of a node?

- Increased rail/light rail transportation around Forest Lakes south could upset residents/increase noise/decrease property values

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- Eliminate Woodbrook road connector
- Possible train transportation
- Rail to City from Airport [note and line drawn on map showing rail extending from existing alignment west to Proffit Road and following Airport Road into the Airport]
- Rails with trails
- Better regard for existing neighborhoods
- Overall focus on bike paths/walkability
- More attention to park n' rides

Alternative C

1. *What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Ruckersville Parkway is not a viable bypass – terrible idea
- No relationship to where community is – too far from community
- Does not create commercial opportunities
- Negative impact on Rivanna Watershed

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. *In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?*

- Lack of traffic signal: safety at GE Fanuc entrance on US 29

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- What do the bold black arrows represent?
- Show City's Downtown as an example of scale, block size, etc. [note on drawing for Alternative B overlaid on the Albemarle Place area]

Group 12

Alternative A

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Utilizes existing US 29 for transportation improvements, which is less costly and keeps traffic going through already compromised zones [note on drawing]
- Focuses most intense uses away from most sensitive areas like mountains, reservoirs, lower river, existing farmland [note on drawing]
- Provides opportunity to maintain most clear delineation “edge” between developed and undeveloped areas; encourages infill and redevelopment more efficiently than other frameworks [note on drawing]
- By keeping development in basically the same area we can encourage more vertical development vs. the one-story sprawl that we already see [note on drawing]
- Recognizes that retail and other commercial uses (town center components) demand exposure to high traffic volumes and are the only uses to pay the high land prices that exist for the US 29 frontage [note on drawing]

2. Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Do not connect Forest Lakes to Northern Free State Road
- Too many traffic signals [Alternative is not specific about the number of traffic signals on US 29]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Likes to see two overpasses or underpasses [Commenter did not indicate where]
- More traffic exists/flows onto Berkmar Drive (shut off some of access to US 29)
- [Consider] One way street concept between Berkmar Drive North and US 29 South
- [Consider] the same concept behind Fashion Square Mall

Alternative B

1. What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?

- Provide roads before allowing development (i.e. Berkmar Drive extended)

The following comments are all from one person:

- New “centers” or “nodes” are slightly “off-line” [off the main roads] and can therefore establish their own tasteful identities that are more enjoyable to spend time in. [note on drawing]
- Parallel roads give 64% of local travelers a number of convenient alternatives to US 29 [note on drawing]
- Parallel roads of smaller stature are more realistically constructed by developers as opposed to VDOT or the public, which never seems to get anything done in a timely manner [note on drawing]
- This option enables the creation of entirely new planned development that would serve as cohesive examples of the Neighborhood Model [note on drawing]
- Provides more opportunity for affordable housing given the greater ultimate density compared to concept A [note on drawing]

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- No sidewalks on US 29 [Alternative does not preclude sidewalks on US 29]
- Northern “downtown” area seems like overkill – too much already

3. *What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?*

- Add public transit: heavy rail/light rail; some form of mass transit option; extend to airport [combination of recorder comments and comments written on drawing]
- Require sidewalks for all commercial development: opens up more opportunity for public transit
- No truck traffic on proposed parallel connectors
- Connect Meadowcreek Parkway to Proffit Road
- B is a decent alternative, however, extend the bypass or parallel road further north to Route 33 in Green County [note on drawing]

Alternative C

1. *What feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative are the most attractive or appealing to you—the ones you would most like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- Likes the idea of more focus on employment centers [note on drawing]

2. *Which feature(s) or aspect(s) of this particular alternative do you feel will not work or represent something you would not like to see in the Northern Development Areas? Why?*

- No western bypass in the Earlysville Road area – too residential for this type of road

- Make road improvements to Highway 20
- Expansion of the Airport – [is an] issue
- No connection to Forest Lakes South [from illustrated parkway east of US 29] [No such connection is illustrated on the framework map]
- No [to Ruckersville Parkway alignment]

3. What changes or additions, if any, would you want to suggest so that this alternative better reflects your idea of a future framework? Why?

- Include Berkmar Drive extended concept from Alternate B – less residential
- Show where these proposed east/west bypasses connect to US 29 (currently off the map)
- Add overpasses to alleviate traffic on US 29
- US 29 – 3 lanes from Hollymead to South Fork of Rivanna River
- BRT [on US 29]
- [marks on map propose] DMU [diesel multiple unit rail service] between Charlottesville and the Airport]

Comments on Sketch Framework Map:

- The two big roads will never be built for a variety of reasons:
 - VDOT has no money
 - Public will never agree where to build it
 - Environmentalists will fight it
 - Tax payers will reject the enormous expense
- Bypasses provide a keener appreciation for the beautiful areas east and west of US 29, but at an incredible expense that does not foster economic development
- Improve highway roads to Route 20 (some are dirt now and have to be paved)
- Rio Road/US 29 and Hydraulic Road/US 29: This neighborhood is diverse in ownership and could therefore develop into an attractive restaurant and retail area of small independent owners. Hollymead, being corporate is more likely to be chain-retail, chain-restaurants = boring
- Pave remainder of Route 640

Comparison of All Three Alternatives

1. In comparing the Alternative Future Framework Plans, do you feel that one particular alternative, or element of an alternative, stands out as more appropriate than the others? If so, please explain why?

- Alternative B overall

- Berkmar Drive extended
- Keep trucks on US 29

2. Do you feel that an additional alternative, or element, that is significantly different from the ones presented here today is needed to describe your concept of a future framework for the Northern Development Areas? If so, what would its main features and aspects be?

- Develop rapid public transit (i.e. rail, etc.)
- Bus rapid transit line on US 29 from University Avenue to Greene County line
- Extend three-lane cross section of US 29 from Hollymead Towncenter to the South Fork of the Rivanna River

3. Is there particular information you would like to have come out of the evaluation phase of Places29 to help you select a preferred Future Framework Plan in the next public workshop?

- [No comments on recorder sheets]

Additional Comments –(received up to 1-11-06)

Following is a summary of comments received during the exhibition of the Sketch Framework Alternatives at the Albemarle County Office Building between November 14 and 23, as well as email messages and letters from individuals who did not have the opportunity to participate in the November 3rd Workshop.

Comment Sheet 1

Framework A

- Would relieve dangerous bottlenecks of external/internal traffic
- should be immediately undertaken

Framework C

- Southern bypass better matches development objectives
- Needs to start at Ruckersville and end (or have major exit) at UVA
- Trucks should be encouraged (not discouraged) to use Southern Parkway to improve Quality of life in P29 area

Other comments

- Transportation infrastructure should include 8 through lanes on 29 from above Airport/Profit Rd to Rivanna Bridge.
- Need to better demonstrate “close coordination” between Greene County, Charlottesville, and UVA
- UVA should be annotating/expanding view of P29 to show its place in region.

Comment Sheet 2

Current assemblage of strip malls along US 29 allows private owners to prohibit free speech. Must pay closer attention to creation of traditional municipal spaces as they allow more freedom with regard to first amendment rights.

Comment Sheet 3

Piney Mountain Area

- Do not widen road in Briarwood: too much traffic already
- Create new road from Briarwood to US 29 e.g. at NGIC traffic light
 - Creates back entrance to Briarwood
 - Keeps heavy equip off existing roads if Briarwood is further developed

- Supports the creation of the NGIC traffic light
- Safety: would calm traffic at dangerous intersection and on residential streets

Comment Sheet 4

- Build the fire station

Email 1

- All through traffic should be removed from US29 to a bypass
- Traffic circles and jug handles could be put on US29 between Charlottesville and Airport Road.

Letter 1

Learn from mistakes of Hollymead Town Center

- Entire area was gutted: esp. destruction of trees and natural area buffers
- Extensive topography changes led to drainage/erosion problems and mudslide which closed US 29
- Resulted in impact on local lakes and streams (silt buildup)

Preserve natural beauty of the county

- Developments should be required to designate percentage of land for preservation/park land
- Alternative to US29 should be a parkway: traffic circles, natural buffers, no trucks
- No Big Box
- Redevelop existing shopping centers instead of greenfield development
- Minimize impact of development, esp. drainage and sediment flow to waterways

Preserve existing neighborhoods

- Keep US29 traffic off of neighborhood streets
- Public parking should be in public places (schools and mini-parks) not neighborhoods (Hollymead Dam)

Preserve natural resources

- Development should use local resources

US29 alternatives

- Alternative local roads address local needs but not through traffic needs
- Revisit bypass option

- Bypass should pass Northern Albemarle growth area.
- Bypass should end North of (not at) Airport Road

Letter 2

Plans currently ignore impending development of Albemarle Place

Should also include Neighborhood #7

- It is a community: has bank, shopping, motel, church, business school
- Need to maintain “free flowing appropriate traffic” throughout this community
- Need to consider what happens after Hydraulic Road
- Traffic from Rio/Hydraulic Road will use Georgetown road for South/West access to avoid US 29/Hydraulic and US 29/250 Bypass junctions
- Traffic using Commonwealth Dr. will use Georgetown Road or neighborhood streets from Hydraulic to avoid major intersections and junctions
- Many other road connections and extensions under consideration add significant traffic pressure onto neighborhood #7, “the City neighborhood,” and problems listed above.