



**Creating and
Connecting
Communities
in Northern Albemarle**

**Places29 Neighborhood Meeting: Hollymead & Piney Mountain
Monday, March 5, 2007
Hollymead Elementary School
7:00pm – 9:00pm**

Over 100 people attended the Places29 Neighborhood Meeting for the communities of Hollymead and Piney Mountain.

Also present: Ken Boyd, chair, Albemarle County Board of Supervisors; Harrison Rue, Executive Director, Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission; Kellem Emanuele, TJPDC; Chuck Proctor, VDOT; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Community Development; David Benish, Chief of Planning, Lee Catlin, Community Relations Director, and Judy Wiegand, Senior Planner. Kathy Galvin, representing the consultant team, also attended.

Introduction. Mr. Ken Boyd opened the meeting with a brief introduction.

Presentation. Judy Wiegand and Harrison Rue gave a presentation on the Places29 Draft Preferred Framework and Transportation Network.

Questions & Answers. Following the presentation, County, TJPDC, and VDOT staff answered the following questions:

1. Concern regarding the road connecting to Ashwood Blvd. Why is this still on the map when residents have repeatedly emphasized that they do not want it.

Staff responded that the "Potential Connection (pedestrian, bicycle, vehicular)" that is shown at the end of Ashwood Blvd. only connects to the County-owned parcel shown in blue on the map. The County does not have a proposed use for that property at this time, but future residents of Forest Lakes will want access to whatever is ultimately built there. While staff does understand that the current residents do not want these roads, staff is required to plan with future residents in mind and those residents may feel differently. Showing the potential connections on the Framework Map means that no structures can be built in the potential right-of-way. This avoids foreclosing the option to construct roads if future residents want them.

The potential connection no longer connects the end of Ashwood to Polo Grounds Road (as it did on an earlier version of the Framework Map). Staff also pointed out that the roads Forest Lakes residents were concerned about were

not included in the transportation modeling and are not part of the solution to the congestion on US 29.

2. No one wants the area to be urban. Why is there so much focus on increasing growth? The plan claims to be based on public input, but public input has repeatedly emphasized that they do not want increased growth.

Staff emphasized that the Development Areas are intended to concentrate development in 5% of the County so that the remaining 95% can be preserved as rural, and also emphasized that the plan does not forecast changes to existing neighborhoods. Staff also indicated that growth is continuing and it is our responsibility to manage it. The intent of the plan is to manage growth so that the desirable characteristics of the area are preserved as much as possible.

3. Has there been any thought given to Schools in these projections?

Staff responded that School District staff has been involved throughout the planning process. However, no specific school site has been identified. Schools and other public facilities will be discussed in the text of the plan.

4. Has there been any thought give to Libraries?

Staff response noted that a library was included in the North Pointe proffer.

5. Has there been any thought given to parking lots? Where are all of these people going to park when they go to all of these new businesses?

Staff response referenced the Neighborhood Model's principle about relegating parking to the rear or side of buildings. So, most parking lots will not be visible in the photosimulations or drawings. The possibility of structured parking was also mentioned, as was the expectation that, when transit is available, some trips will be made on transit.

6. Has there been any thought given to water infrastructure?

Staff response noted the cost and resource efficiency of concentrating growth in development areas. Staff also indicated that they are meeting with the Rivanna Water & Sewer Authority and the Albemarle County Service Authority to determine whether additional supply, capacity, or treatment will be needed.

7. When will the projects in this plan start?

Staff response noted that implementation of the plan will begin immediately after the plan is adopted—now expected toward the end of 2007. Staff also noted that some projects from the earlier phases of the 29H250 study are already in the design and funding process.

8. Will the secondary road network be built by the time the bridge construction begins?

Staff indicated that the bridge will be an essential part of the Berkmar Drive Extended road, so it will be built at the same time the road is built.

9. Will the parallel roads be improved? Currently, many of the parallel roads are too curvy to serve as an alternative to taking Rt. 29.

Staff indicated that some of the existing parallel roads (e.g., Dickerson Road) are already planned for improvement.

10. There is not enough green/open space in this plan. Many Forest Lakes residents are concerned that the area around Forest Lakes will be much too dense.

Staff responded that Forest Lakes is expected to remain the same—no changes are planned. Staff also pointed out that residents should not expect the plan to include larger parks in the Development Areas. Instead, these larger parks will be outside the Development Areas, but will be accessible. Staff promised to work with the consultants on the issue of smaller parks.

11. This plan doesn't seem to recognize that Forest Lakes is a planned development. By design it has one way in and one way out. That's how the residents want it to be.

Staff indicated that they knew Forest Lakes was a planned community and that no changes were included in the plan within the community. The road (labeled a "Possible Connection-beyond 2025") shown through the undeveloped area in the northeast corner of US 29 and Polo Grounds Road is intended to serve potential residents of any new development in that area and will not be built until that area develops. The road is not intended to serve residents of Forest Lakes.

12. Will the planned Berkmar bridge be too close to the reservoir? There are several environmental concerns that will need to be addressed with this bridge.

Staff indicated that they are aware of the environmental issues and that proximity of the proposed bridge to the reservoir has been taken into account.

Comments. Then, those present broke out into four smaller groups to record their comments about the Places29 Draft Framework and Transportation Network:

Group 1

1. How many use existing transit/public transit? Has this been reviewed? Public transit in this area = unrealistic; walking = unrealistic; biking = unrealistic
2. Mass transit for off-shifts? (future)
3. IMPACT – no public transit on Sunday, etc. Public transit – necessity 3/15 @ MLK

4. Price? How/what goes forward, re infrastructure
5. Payment is from development/private infrastructure—VDOT not paying
6. Concentrate growth in growth area
7. Cost of Bypass vs. P29 costs; phasing? Which first?
8. Infrastructure in place first; developers/development not determine
9. Why is 29Bypass off table?
10. Current situation works, but barely—need to think ahead; not expand 29 to 12 lanes
11. Connected Neighborhoods—workable situations
12. do not want traffic in Forest Lakes
13. Meadowcreek Parkway up to 29?
14. Net increase in green/open space w/ this plan?
15. Denser development to get more green space
16. % req. for open space? About equal to 20% (depends on devel); open space = active areas & not built areas (not all critical slopes, etc.)
17. % of devel./residential units = affordable; policy = 15%: through cash contribution; mortgage buydown & construction
18. Constrain development to where infrastructure exists?
19. How implement? Investment; balance existing; decisionmaking
20. Implementation = everything; same focus on implementation as design; bring implementation plan to public
21. County – landowner partnerships
22. Albemarle Place – connection to Berkmar? (Greenbriar)
23. Big box trade for roadway connection; connect back to 29—same problem
24. Carrsbrook: bike/walk connection?

Group 2

- Like the plan
- PARKING NEAR TRANSIT
- Forest Lakes shuttle (jitney?)
- Peak commute time longer than model
- Interconnecting roads positive
- Emphasis on public/green space areas
- Restrict & respect development area boundaries
- Like grade-separated interchanges
- Roads contained w/in growth area
- Like traffic circles – bigger necessary? (school buses)
- Positive transportation plan – better scale
- Traffic blockage on Route 29 – haz mat possibility?
- What happens after plan is adopted??
- No more big boxes

Group 3

- Widen SU 29: Polo grounds to Hollymead Town Center
- Green County traffic – use park-n-ride lots at north end of US 29
- Like Berkmar Extended
- Concerned about paying for additional schools necessary for additional growth

- Redevelopment – take care of empty stores first
- Low-income = trailer parks; be aware of
- Need more open/green space than shown on Green Infrastructure Map; especially ballfields, places to walk dogs, and natural places
- Studies conducted by the Dept. of Justice and the National Science Foundation show that interconnections and mixed use both contribute to increased crime. Has Places29 been reviewed by professionals to look at the crime issue?
- What about the 22-acre parcel right in the middle of Forest Lakes that's owned by a church in Richmond? [question about a recent rezoning]
- Creating urban space – current people not happy with this; will new people want this?
- Need more access to the Post Office; the Uptown will need a post office—at least more drop boxes
- Concerned about the widening of US 29 at the Ashwood/29 intersection- impact on nearby land uses
- Will the new development [NE quadrant of Polo Grounds and US 29] require school buses or will the students be dropped off in cars? Concern about road network and school buses from newly developed area coming through onto Ashwood Blvd.
- Need to be sure you can bike to NGIC
- Need more trees
- Suing a parallel road is a desperate solution for a desperate problem
- The whole problem is so overwhelming
- Destructive of neighborhoods
- Anything in the plan about 29?
- 65% think we're growing too fast; 30% don't [something about a poster in the County Office Building]
- They don't maintain Hydraulic Road; people make illegal left turns all the time; no one stops them; dangerous intersection

Group 4

Question: Road speed at parallel roads?

Question: Any substantial large parks in Das?

Question: Beautification of 29 North? Setbacks?

Question: Pricing of facilities and maintenance? Will this mean more taxes? Too much already; horsepath needed?

Concern/Question: Free State Road will put pressure on Proffit

Concern/Question: too much trouble to deal with the "jug handles"; too convoluted

Concern/Question: *Airport Road is the priority overpass – why then is Timberwood necessary, nor Ashwood

Concern/Question: Worth Crossing/Timberwood intersection – concerned about safety – This will draw more people to Timberwood and Proffit Road & Worth.

Mentioned the traffic circle

Question/Concern: How much care will be taken to prevent stormwater runoff problems both during construction and after?

Question/Concern: Do away with parallel – do diagonal parking

Concern/Question: Like shopping areas look, like the trees, but how many cyclists are we anticipating? Answer: there has been an increased request for bike paths.

Concern/Question: where's the parking at the Albemarle Square photosim?

Concern/Question: parking garages will require you to pay for parking

Concern/Question: So much of the design is about beauty – but what about costs, open space, sidewalks, [curb?]cuts, profits and increased costs to developers? How about affordable housing – the bike paths take away \$ for roads and affordable housing.

Concern/Question: Meadowcreek Parkway – took 30 years and still not built, so very doubtful of the feasibility of the project. It is too expensive to live here.

Concern/Question: How to protect neighborhoods when roads are not built first. If you accept growth, then infrastructure must precede the development.

Concern/Question: Hydraulic (Airport Road agrees) Road should happen before Airport Rd

Concern/Question: Take advantage of existing infrastructure before expanding it

Concern/Question: Have infrastructure near the workforce (Research Pk and NGIC)

Concern/Question: Water/Drought -0 concerned about high density growth in light of recent droughts. #1 priority for sustainability

Concern/Question: Research Park should include residential (i.e., townhouses)

Concern/Question: Think of a commuter "Hub" @ the North End – shuttle service

Concern/Question: Why not thinking about a new High School, other levels as well

Concern/Question: Very much appreciated the local meeting

Concern/Question: Park-n-ride next to trailheads

Concern/Question: With the high expected job growth – where will these people live?